
JRC Scientific and Technical Reports



Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) Evaluation of 2009 Annual Reports related to the Data Collection Framework Report of the Subgroup on Research Needs (SGRN 10-02)

5-10 JULY 2010, HAMBURG

Edited by Christoph Stransky & Hendrik Doerner

EUR 24535 EN - 2010

The mission of the Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen (IPSC) is to provide research results and to support EU policy-makers in their effort towards global security and towards protection of European citizens from accidents, deliberate attacks, fraud and illegal actions against EU policies

The Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) has been established by the European Commission. The STECF is being consulted at regular intervals on matters pertaining to the conservation and management of living aquatic resources, including biological, economic, environmental, social and technical considerations.

European Commission
Joint Research Centre
Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Contact information

Address: TP 051, 21027 Ispra (VA), Italy
E-mail: stecf-secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu
Tel.: 0039 0332 789343
Fax: 0039 0332 789658

<https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home>
<http://ipsc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>
<http://www.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>

Legal Notice

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of this publication.

This report does not necessarily reflect the view of the European Commission and in no way anticipates the Commission's future policy in this area.

***Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers
to your questions about the European Union***

**Freephone number (*):
00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11**

(*) Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers or these calls may be billed.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet. It can be accessed through the Europa server <http://europa.eu/>

JRC59836

EUR 24535 EN
ISBN 978-92-79-16789-8
ISSN 1018-5593
doi:10.2788/18683
Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union
© European Union, 2010

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged

Printed in Italy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Terms of reference	4
3.	STECF Comments and Conclusions	4
4.	ANNEX I – Report of SGRN 10-02	8

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT

Evaluation of 2009 Annual Reports related to the Data Collection Framework (SGRN-10-02)

SUBGROUP ON RESEARCH NEEDS (SGRN) OF THE SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF)

STECF OPINION EXPRESSED DURING THE PLENARY MEETING (PLEN-10-02)

Copenhagen, 12-16 July 2010

1. INTRODUCTION

STECF is requested to review the report of the **SGRN-10-02** Working Group meeting (Hamburg, 5-10 July), evaluate the findings and make any appropriate comments and recommendations.

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Evaluation of 2009 Annual Reports in accordance with Article 7.2 of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008, taking into account
 - a. The execution of the National Programmes 2009
 - b. The quality of the data collected by the Member states
 - c. Information from end users on data transmission in 2009

2. Review of Comments made at STECF in Spring plenary

In particular the following issues will be dealt with:

Data Deficiencies subgroup to assess the state of play of user's feed back and develop a template and procedure for reporting data deficiencies by data user groups (STECF, ICES, ICCAT, GFCM and other RFMOs or international scientific bodies)

To this end an ad hoc subgroup will be appointed. The main task of this subgroup is identifying data failures in order to allow the Commission to enforce MS obligations on a clear basis. It is expected that quality, comparability and coherence issues will be raised by the economists and biologists, with particular emphasis on quality checks. The following information will be analysed by the subgroup:

- a. Balance of data transmission to end-users in 2009. Particular attention will be paid to the provision of feedback by ICES and relevant RFMOs

on data availability, quality, gaps and the data used in the scientific advisory process.

- b. Response by MS to calls for data for fisheries advice providing data for STECF meetings and evaluation of sub groups' feedback on data quality.
 - c. Response by MS to the call for economic data launched to produce the draft report on the "Economic Performance of EU Fishing Fleet: Annual Report 2010 (AER)"
3. Examine the current status of preparations for the review of research surveys to be carried out in October 2010.
4. AOB

3. STECF COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

STECF observations

STECF appreciates that a draft report of the meeting was made available to STECF 4 days after the meeting. Based on the draft report, STECF endorses the recommendations and findings of SGRN 10-02, except for the following:

SGRN remarks that “unpaid labour” is an issue in some Member States and therefore data should be further collected. If a MS notices that unpaid labour does not play any role in its economy, it can ask for derogation in the NP.

STECF does not agree that Member States should be granted a derogation not to sample for unpaid labour in the processing or other sectors. This is because, although unpaid labour may not have existed in the past, it could occur in the future, therefore MS must sample it.

STECF notes that the former term 'Technical Reports' that was related to the DCR is now being replaced by the term 'Annual Reports' in accordance with the DCF Implementation Regulation 665/2008.

STECF welcomes the progress in developing a procedure and template tables for data-user feedback on data availability & quality, as follow-up of the STECF April 2010 Plenary recommendations.

With regard to the review of surveys, STECF notes that the work plan drafted by SGRN 09-04 has been largely followed and that the survey lists compiled by the DCF Regional Co-ordination Meetings (RCMs) are now complete and ready to be forwarded to the Chair of the Survey Review meeting (SGRN 10-03, Brussels, 4-8 Oct 2010).

STECF comments and conclusions

STECF supports the suggestion to allow experts to read DCF Annual Reports before working group meetings in order to make evaluation meetings as efficient as possible and to allow sufficient time for discussing general issues at meetings. STECF recommends that the Commission consider ways in which this could best be achieved including compensating experts for such preparatory work, e.g. by ad-hoc contracts before working group meetings or through the expertise support framework within the DCF.

STECF agrees that the recurring issue of sampling coverage of Long-Distance Fisheries (e.g. CECAF, ICCAT, SPRFMO) needs special attention and recommends that the Commission establishes a forum bringing together data-users (e.g. RFMOs) and data collectors, in order to discuss data needs and possibilities for sampling coverage. STECF notes that first attempts to co-ordinate sampling were made by the DCF Regional Co-ordination Meeting (RCM) on Long-Distance Fisheries (Madrid, 3-5 March 2010).

Considering the data-user feedback tables, STECF supports SGRN's approach to distribute these templates to the appropriate RFMOs and STECF working groups (SGECA on Annual Economic Report, SGMOS on Fishing Effort, etc.), in order to obtain suggestions for further improvement of the templates. STECF re-iterates its April 2010 Plenary recommendation to include the following request in Terms of Reference for all of its Working Group meetings: "Examine all data for consistency and quality. Any discrepancies should be brought to the attention of the relevant responsible authority, Member State and the Commission."

STECF notes that several SGRN 10-02 recommendations are related to a revision of current DCF requirements (e.g. data quality of transversal variables, segmentation based on Full-time Equivalents) and suggests that the implications of changes in DCF requirements are discussed in the appropriate STECF working groups (i.e. SGRN 11-01, SGECA 10-03).

STECF notes that the working group recommended that all MS should collect economic and transversal data regarding the fishing fleet for all fishing vessels in the vessel register during the reference year, instead of only collecting data on vessels in the fleet register on the 1st of January in the relevant reference year. The working group also proposed these follow up activities: Member States to respect these recommendations. SGRN and SGECA to monitor the progress. STECF supports this recommendation, but goes further and recommends that the DCF regulation should be changed to state that the population of vessels must include all vessels included on the vessel register at any time during the reference year. As it stands, the DCF regulation states that the population of vessels is those on the vessel register on 1st January in the reference year. This current definition of the population is weak as it excludes the activity of all vessels which joined the fleet after 1st January in the reference year.

Independent of the work done by SGRN Working Groups, in relation to data submission of Member States in response to calls for data through the DCF, STECF notes that:

- Data submissions in response to DCF data calls represent an official national statement.
- Official national statements need to be qualitatively and quantitatively accurate and the responsibility lies with the Member State.
- Accuracy of the data should be confirmed by the Member State before the data are submitted.
- Member States are advised to aggregate the data as defined in the data call within the specified time period. Any clarification on the requested aggregation can always be obtained from the Commission through the specified contact persons specified in the data call.
- Member States are advised to develop data quality checking tools and to apply such tools before the data are submitted.
- Only quality checked data should be submitted via the data uploading tools.

4. ANNEX I – REPORT OF SGRN-10-02

SGRN-10-02: Evaluation of 2009 Annual Reports related to the Data Collection Framework
(SGRN-10-02)

Hamburg, 5-10 July 2010

*This report does not necessarily reflect the view of the European Commission and in no way
anticipates the Commission's future policy in this area*

Table of contents

SUMMARY

The main objectives of the SGRN 10-02 meeting were to evaluate the Annual Reports (AR) 2009 submitted by Member States (MS) under the Data Collection Framework (DCF, Council Reg. 199/2008), to advise on a procedure for the identification of deficiencies within the submission of MS data to scientific working groups, and to examine the current status of preparations for the review of research surveys to be undertaken in Oct. 2010.

In general, SGRN found that MS had mostly complied with the DCF requirements and the guidelines for submission of AR. Two reports were submitted 2 weeks after the deadline, and one MS did not submit an AR at all. While evaluating the reports, SGRN made several suggestions for improving the guidelines and table templates for AR submission and drafted some first guidance for AR evaluators in order to harmonise the process further across all AR evaluations.

In order to allow for sufficient preparation of the AR evaluation, SGRN recommends that the time frame from registration to the beginning of the meeting should be expanded to a minimum of 3 weeks (preferably 4 weeks, and 2 months in the case of stock assessment meetings), and that an automated checking routine for the submitted standard tables and MS compliance is being developed and conducted before the meeting.

SGRN repeatedly found limitations in the AR evaluation process by the non-availability of a full list of MS derogations and their latest status and recommends that the European Commission prepares such a list before the next AR evaluation meeting.

SGRN found several obvious gaps in sampling coverage (long-distance fisheries, Corsica) that need to be clarified by MS and rectified in future.

As (yet) no MS has been able to reach any of the target precision levels (CVs) required by the DCF, SGRN recommends a revision of DCF requirements with regard to target precision levels to be achieved.

With regard to the reporting of data quality indicators for economic variables (fleet and aquaculture/processing industry), SGRN recommends several improvements and considers that the guidelines for submission of AR 2010 make the reporting mandatory.

SGRN reviewed the feedback from data users regarding data availability and quality, i.e. expert groups of Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) and STECF working groups, and identified four 'clusters' of problems that should be dealt with on all levels of the involved parties (MS, Commission, RFMOs and expert groups). As the MS response to Data Calls of the Commission is in many cases insufficient, MS are reminded to quality-check their data and upload them within the given time frame to allow expert groups to address their Terms of Reference. Technical problems during the data transmission have to be reported to the respective body calling for the data. SGRN has developed templates for end-user feedback to be circulated to the corresponding RFMO and STECF expert groups.

The review of research surveys-at-sea will be conducted by SGRN 10-03 in October 2010. For the preparation of the meeting, lists of existing surveys have been compiled by the Regional Co-ordination Meetings (RCMs) in May 2010, collated by the Commission, revised by MS comments in June and will now be forwarded to the Chair of the review group.

INTRODUCTION

SGRN working tasks

In addition to the review of Annual Reports submitted under the Data Collection Framework (DCF), SGRN 10-02 was tasked with evaluating data deficiencies reported by data end-users, and with providing information on the status of the Review of Surveys. Some other strategic tasks had been dealt with by SGRN 10-01 (Ispra, 14-19 June 2010), with several tasks transferred to a dedicated strategic SGRN meeting anticipated early 2011.

Terminology and abbreviations

In accordance with Article 5(1) of Commission Regulation 665/2008, the former (DCR) term 'Technical Reports' (TR) was replaced by the term 'Annual Report' (AR).

SGRN 10-02 participants

The participants were:

MEMBERS OF THE STECF:

Massimiliano Cardinale
Antonio DiNatale
Tore Gustavsson
Christoph Stransky (Chair)

INVITED EXPERTS:

Angeliki Adamidou
Apostolos Apostolou
Angeles Armesto
Rickard Bengtsberg
Jörg Berkenhagen
Paolo Carpentieri
Irina Davidjuka
Henrik Degel
Marina Dias
Christian Dintheer
Michael Ebeling
Leyre Goti
Francesca Gravino
Enrico Longoni
Timo Myllylä
Tomasz Nermer
Gráinne Ní Chonchúir
Dario Pinello
Tiit Raid
Ivo Sics

Jens Ulleweit
 Darcelle Vassallo
 Kai Wieland
 Lucia Zarauz

JRC EXPERT:

Jarno Virtanen

EUROPEAN COMMISSION:

DG- Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (MARE)

Antonio Cervantes (EU Commission)
 Herwig Ranner (EU Commission)
 Angel Calvo (EU Commission)

JRC- STECF secretariat:

Virginia Biec (JRC)

OBSERVER:

Cristina Morgado (ICES observer)

The contact details for the participants are given below:

Name	Address	Telephone no.	Email
STECF members			
Cardinale, Massimiliano	Swedish Board of Fisheries, Institute of Marine Research, 45 321, Lysekil, Sweden	Tel 00-46-730-34-22-09	massimiliano.cardinale@fiskeriverket.se
Di Natale, Antonio	Aquastudio via Trapani, 6, 98121 Messina Italy	Tel 00-39-090-34-64-08/00-39-010-23-45-221 Fax 00-39-090-36-45-60/00-39-010-25-61-60	aquauno@tin.it adinatale@acquariodigenova.it
Gustavsson, Tore Karl-Erik	Fiskeriverket, National Board of Fisheries, Ekonomi och personalenheten, Box 423, 401 26, Göteborg, Sverige	Tel 00-46-31-74-30-300 Fax 00-46-31-74-30-444	tore.gustavsson@fiskeriverket.se
Stransky, Christoph (chair)	Johann Heinrich von Thünen Institute [vTI] Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Institute of Sea Fisheries, Palmaille 9, D-22767 Hamburg, Germany	Tel. +49 40 38905-228 Fax: +49 40 38905-263	christoph.stransky@vti.bund.de
Invited experts			
Adamidou, Angeliki	NAGREF-Fisheries Research Institute, Nea Peramos 64007 Kavala Greece	Tel. 30-25940-21273	adamidou@inale.gr
Apostolou, Apostolos	ABV, 1 Tsar Osvoboditel Blvd, 1000 Sofia, Bulgaria	Tel. +359 2 98851 15	apostolosfish@abv.bg

Name	Address	Telephone no.	Email
Armesto, Angeles	Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Cabo Estay-Canido, 36200, Vigo, Spain	Tel. 34986492111	angeles.armesto@vi.ieo.es
Bengtsberg, Rickard	Swedish Board of Fisheries, Ekelundsgatan 1, PO Box 423, 40126, Göteborg, Sweden	Tel. 4631-7430358	rickard.bengtsberg@fiskeriverket.se
Berkenhagen, Jörg	Federal Research Centre for Fisheries Palmaille 9 22767 Hamburg, Germany	+ 49 40 38905206	joerg.berkenhagen@ish.bfa-fisch.de
Carpentieri, Paolo	MIPAF, Viale dell'Università 32, Rome, Italy	+39 003288731537	paolo.carpentieri@uniroma1.it
Davidjuka, Irina	Fish Resources Research Department, Daugavgrivas 8, LV-1048, Riga, Latvia	Tel. +371 67617527	irina.davidjuka@bior.gov.lv
Degel, Henrik	Danish Fisheries Research Institute Charlottenlund Slot, 2920 Charlottenlund, Denmark	+ 4524824198	hd@difres.dk
Dias, Marina	IPIMAR - National Laboratory of Marine Research, Av. Brasília, 1449-006 LISBOA, Portugal	Tel. +351 21 302 7185 Fax +351 21 301 5948	mdias@ipimar.pt
Dintheer, Christian	IFREMER, Rue de l'Île d'Yeu BP 21105, 44311, NANTES, France	Tel. 33 02 40 37 40 00 Fax 33 02 40 37 42 13	christian.dintheer@ifremer.fr
Ebeling, Michael	Federal Research Centre for Fisheries Palmaille 9 22767 Hamburg, Germany	+ 040-38905212	Michael.Ebeling@ish.bfa-fisch.de
Goti, Leyre	General Concha 44, 4ºcentro izda, 48012, Bilbao, Spain		leyregoti@yahoo.com
Gravino, Francesca	Agriculture and Fisheries Regulation Department, Fort San Lucjan, BBG 1283, Marsaxlokk, Malta	Tel. 35622293326 Fax 35621659380	francesca.gravino@gov.mt
Longoni, Enrico	Seafish, 18 Logie Mill, EH7 4HS, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	Tel. +44(0)131 524 8659 Fax +44(0)131 524 8696	e_longoni@seafish.com
Myllylä, Timo	Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute, Viikinkaari 4, P.O. Box 2, FI-00791, Helsinki, Finland		timo.myllyla@rktl.fi
Nermer, Tomasz	The Sea Fisheries Institute in Gdynia, Kollataja 1 81-332, Gdynia, Poland	Tel. 48587356211 Fax 48587356110	nermer@mir.gdynia.pl
Ní Chonchúir, Gráinne	The Marine Institute Rinvile, Oranmore, Co. Galway, Ireland	Tel. 35391387200	grainne.nichonchuir@marine.ie
Pinello, Dario	IREPA, VIA SAN LEONARDO, TRAV MIGLIARO, 84100, SALERNO, Italy	Tel. 39089330919 Fax 39089330835	pinello@irepa.org
Raid, Tiit	Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu, Estonia		tiit.raid@gmail.com
Sics, Ivo	Latvian Fish resources Agency, Daugavgrivas 8, LV-1048 Riga, Latvia	Tel. 37128396003	Ivo.Sics@lzra.gov.lv
Ulleweit, Jens	Johann Heinrich von Thünen Federal Research, Institute of Sea Fisheries, Palmaille 9, D-22767 Hamburg, Germany	Tel. 0049 40 38905217	jens.ulleweit@vti.bund.de

Name	Address	Telephone no.	Email
Vassallo, Darcelle	Agriculture and Fisheries Regulation Department, Fort San Lucjan, BBG 1283, Marsaxlokk, Malta	Tel. 0035622293315 Fax 00356 21659380	darcelle.vassallo@gov.mt
Wieland, Kai	DTU Aqua, PO Box 101, 9850, Hirtshals Denmark	Tel. +45 33963276 Fax +45 33963260	kw@aqua.dtu.dk
Zarauz, Lucia	AZTI-Tecnalia, Txatxarramendi Ugarte a z/g, 48395, Sukarrieta (Bizkaia), Spain		lzarauz@azti.es

Observer			
Morgado, Cristina	ICES, Denmark		Cristina@ices.dk
JRC expert			
Virtanen, Jarno	Joint Research Centre JRC, Maritime Affairs Unit Building 5A, TP 051 21027 Ispra Italy	Tel: +39 0332789614 Fax: +39 03329658	jarno.virtanen@jrc.ec.europa.eu
European Commission			
Biec, Virginia	Joint Research Centre JRC, STECF secretariat	Tel: +39 0332789658 Fax: +39 03329658	Virginia.biec@ec.europa.eu Stecf-payments@jrc.ec.europa.eu
Calvo, Angel	DG MARE	Tel. +(32) 2 2993630	Angel-Andres.CALVO-SANTOS@ec.europa.eu
Cervantes, Antonio	DG MARE	Tel. 0332 229 965162	antonio.cervantes@ec.europa.eu
Ranner, Herwig	DG MARE	Tel. 0332 229 99805	herwig.ranner@ec.europa.eu

SECTION 1

Evaluation of the 2009 Annual Reports

ORGANISATION ASPECTS

SGRN 10-02 notes that this is the first time that Annual Reports (AR) under the revised DCF (Reg. 199/2008, Decision 2008/949/EC) were evaluated. Accordingly, the guidance for evaluators had to be adapted, and SGRN 10-02 concluded on a set of evaluation questions (see template in Annex 4) during the first day of the meeting, based on experience during SGRN 10-01 (Review of DCF NPs 2011-13), previous evaluations of DCR Technical Reports and the Guidelines & standard tables for submission of AR 2009. The evaluation process included the provision of Member State compliance levels with the various elements of the AR, similar to previous evaluations of DCR Technical Reports and NP proposals:

Compliance class	Compliance level
No	<10%
Partly	10-50%
Mostly	50-90%
Yes	>90%
NA	not applicable

The evaluation of the general parts and biological variables of the AR 2009 was conducted in four regional sub-groups, consisting of 3-5 persons evaluating 4-6 MS reports each. Potential 'conflicts of interest' (participants evaluating an AR of their own MS) were avoided, and the core of the regional expertise and language skills (see comments on the French AR below) were taken into consideration when allocating persons to sub-groups.

The 'economic' AR parts were evaluated by two sub-groups of economists divided by subjects: 6 persons working on fleet economics & transversal variables, 3 persons working on the economic variables of aquaculture and the processing industry.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Submission dates of Annual Reports 2009 and languages

Most of the MS (13 of 22) submitted their Annual Reports (AR) 2009 related to the DCF in accordance with the deadline according to Article 5(1) of Commission Regulation 665/2008 (31 May 2010). Two reports were delayed by 2 weeks. One MS did not submit an AR at all. The Spanish AR was submitted in Spanish and translated to English by Commission services until the end of the first day of SGRN-10-02 (5 July 2010). The French AR was submitted in French, and as it was delayed by 2 weeks, an official Commission translation could not be arranged before the meeting. The French AR was therefore partly translated to English by other means (internet machine translation) and predominantly read and evaluated by participants with sufficient language skills in French. SGRN would like to repeat its previous

recommendation that reports should preferably be submitted in English in order to make the evaluation process as transparent and efficient as possible.

The table below lists the submission dates of the AR 2009 by MS.

Member State	Date of submission
Belgium	02.06.2010
Bulgaria	31.05.2010
Cyprus	14.06.2010
Denmark	31.05.2010
Estonia	01.06.2010
Finland	04.06.2010
France	14.06.2010
Germany	31.05.2010
Greece	- ¹
Ireland	28.05.2010
Italy	31.05.2010
Latvia	31.05.2010
Lithuania	31.05.2010
Malta	08.06.2010
Netherlands	31.05.2010
Poland	31.05.2010
Portugal	04.06.2010
Romania	01.06.2010
Slovenia	31.05.2010
Spain	31.05.2010
Sweden	27.05.2010
United Kingdom	31.05.2010

¹no Annual Report received from Greece

Deadline for registration to STECF working groups and participant selection system

Most of the STECF working groups require a careful scrutiny of a large amount of documents to allow the participants to arrive sufficiently prepared at the working group in order to address all Terms of Reference in the required detail and quality. Such scrutiny of documents usually requires several days of working in advance.

However, the current system usually informs the participants of their selection to the working groups only one week in advance. This obviously does not allow neither for a sufficient preparation of the meeting nor for cost-efficient travel arrangements and timely organisation of other commitments for each of the participants.

Therefore, SGRN considers that a period of **at least 3 weeks** (preferably 4 weeks) should be allocated from the day when the participant is selected to the start of the meeting. For assessment WGs such as SGMED, the period should be even longer for those appointed as stock coordinators, with the participants' selection done **at least 2 months** (preferably 3 months) in advance to allow for a proper preparation of the assessment.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends that a period of at least 3 weeks (preferably 4 weeks) should be allocated from the day when a participant of STECF working group is selected to the start of the meeting. For assessment WGs such as SGMED, the period should be even longer for those appointed as stock coordinators, with the participants' selection done at least 2 months (preferably 3 months) in advance to allow for a proper preparation of the assessment.	European Commission to revise procedures for STECF working group participants selection.

Automated scrutiny of the level of compliance of the Annual Reports

Considering the large amount of segments, métiers and stocks contained in the AR tables that have to be checked at each SGRN meeting, a more automatic, time-saving and - most important – error-free system would be beneficial. SGRN suggests that such automatic system can be easily developed by an ad-hoc group of people that is appointed to work by correspondence and possibly re-imbursed by short-term contracts by DG MARE. SGRN suggests that this group will be responsible to develop an automatic checking routine (e.g. an R script) of the level of compliance of each MS in the AR, concerning the achieved and planned sampling level of the different modules.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends that an automatic checking system for the level of compliance of each MS in the AR, concerning the achieved and planned sampling level of the different modules, should be developed and implemented by an ad-hoc group of people that is appointed to work by correspondence and possibly re-imbursed by short-term contracts by DG MARE.	European Commission to consider establishment of short-term contracts for checking of DCF ARs.

Complete list of derogations and their status

In order to fully evaluate MS compliance with their NP proposals and the DCF requirements, SGRN had repeatedly identified the need for a complete list of derogations and their status (granted/rejected/pending etc.). SGRN recommends that this list will be prepared by the Commission in advance of the meeting, as the most recent and valid derogation status is based on bilateral negotiations between MS and the Commission.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends having a complete list of MS derogations and their most recent and valid status available to fully evaluate MS compliance with their NP proposals and the DCF requirements.	European Commission to prepare a full list of derogations and their status in advance of SGRN evaluation meetings.

Improvements of guidelines & standard table templates

Formatting issues

SGRN found several problems with the formatting of AR text and table files that had limited full consideration of all AR contents at the beginning of the meeting.

The file formats should be Microsoft Office 2003 (Word: *.doc, Excel: *.xls) instead of more recent versions (Office 2007: *.docx, *.xlsx), as only a part of the evaluators was able to open and read files in formats other than Office 2003.

In the standard tables provided by some MS, filters for certain cell contents were active and columns were hidden. This should not be the case.

These formatting issues should be fully taken into account when revising guidelines and standard tables for submission of ARs (and NP proposals).

Standard tables

Only data of the AR year (2009 in this case) should be reported, i.e. not the data available from other years of the multiannual programmes (2010 in this case).

Table II.B.1 should include all meetings of the official list of eligible meetings provided by the Commission in December each year preceding the NP year.

In Table II.B.1, a separate column for acronyms of Expert Groups should be inserted, in order to allow sorting of lines for direct comparison with NP proposals.

In Table III.E.3, the numbers of otoliths collected as well as the numbers read should be reported, as the achieved precision target (CV) is based on the numbers read.

In order to avoid multiple reporting of the same data in metier (III.C) and stock tables (III.E), e.g. fish measured by species/area, the corresponding tables have to be revised.

Guidelines:

In general, it should be made clear that in the AR, only data of the AR year (2009 in this case) should be reported, i.e. not the data available from other years of the multiannual programmes (2010 in this case).

The term "deviations" should be used throughout and references to "shortfalls" should be re-named to "deviations".

The guidelines should clearly state that CVs are required to be reported as values and not levels.

When parts of the NP proposal standard tables are copied into the AR tables, all necessary information (incl. e.g. footnotes) should be copied, in order to avoid unnecessary cross-checking with NP tables by the AR evaluators.

In order to avoid multiple reporting of the same data in metier (III.C) and stock tables (III.E), e.g. fish measured by species/area, the guidelines how to fill in the corresponding standard tables have to be revised.

In section III.G, recommendations of survey planning groups are to be taken into account in addition to the RCM recommendations.

RCM recommendations should all be listed in one place instead of being spread by regions or report sections.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends several improvements for the guidelines and standard table templates for AR submission, see SGRN 10-02 report for details.	SGRN to revise guidelines and table templates for the submission of DCF ARs.

Improvements of guidance to evaluators

The questions asking for "Are deviations/actions explained and acceptable/justified?" should be split into "Are deviations/actions explained?" and "Are explanations for deviations/actions acceptable/justified?".

In the case of evaluating data quality, it should be made clear if these questions relate to both the reporting of CVs and achieving CV targets. These evaluations should be performed based on 2 different questions.

Deviations from the NP proposal and from the AR guidelines should be dealt with separately.

The term "deviations" should be used throughout and references to "shortfalls" should be renamed to "deviations".

The basis for the judgement on MS compliance (Yes/No/Partly/Mostly) should be specified clearly. SGRN suggests that compliance should be investigated by each line in the standard tables (e.g. metiers, stocks, economic variable/unit) and then summarised over all lines. It should be made clear if the deviations to be investigated relate to planned vs. achieved numbers or CVs, etc.

SGRN noted that the evaluators questions for section III.D (recreational fisheries) have to be adapted according to the special requirements regarding this module.

The evaluation of section F (transversal variables) has to be condensed, see comments under 'Economic & transversal variables' below.

The first question under section III.G.2 ("Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?") can only be fully addressed by data end users (survey planning groups and stock assessment WGs). SGRN

recommends replacing this question by the standard question "Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?".

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends several improvements for the guidance of AR evaluators, see SGRN 10-02 report for details.	SGRN to revise guidance for DCF AR evaluators.

Long-Distance Fisheries sampling

The lack of data collected from EU fishing fleets operating in distant waters (CECAF, South Pacific, Indian Ocean, etc.) has been a serious issue for several MS in previous years, as remarked several times since the beginning of DCR (now DCF) by SGRN and by STECF. In 2009, several MS fishing in distant waters requested again derogations for sampling these fleets and fisheries or simply did not fully report these activities.

SGRN 10-02 recalls that all the fishing agreements with non-EU Third Countries are established within the framework of the Common Fishery Policy and following the philosophy of the Green Paper adopted by the European Commission in 2008. According to COM(2002)637-final, the fishing agreements with non-EU Third Countries are possible only if there is *“a sustainable exploitation of fishing resources, based on sound scientific advice, coherent with the Community objective to avoid overexploitation of the stocks concerned,, therefore fishing possibilities must be in line with and based on best available scientific data.”*

Furthermore, SGRN notes that all the various versions of the DCR/DCF included the obligation to sample all EU fishing activities, independently from the area where they are carried out, also to comply with the Code of Responsible Fishery.

On this legal basis, SGRN recommends that no derogations should be accepted for collecting data in areas where EU fleets are operating according to fishing agreements with non-EU Third Countries. SGRN underlines that all target species concerned and all species for which it is mandatory to collect data according to the provision of the DCF and the RFMO concerned, must be included in the NP and AR of each MS concerned. SGRN strongly recommends that the Commission takes the necessary measures to stop this unacceptable situation and obliges the MS concerned to comply with the existing laws and regulations and with the Code of Responsible Fishery.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends that no derogations should be accepted for collecting data in distant areas where EU fleets are operating according to fishing agreement with non-EU Third Countries.	European Commission to take the necessary measures to oblige the MS concerned to comply with the DCF regarding long-distance fisheries sampling and with existing regulations related to fishing agreements with non-EU Third Countries.

SGRN reminds MS to attend the RCM Long-Distance Fisheries (LDF) in future if the corresponding MS has a long-distance fishery in "Other regions" and to be equipped with the

necessary data, background information and mandate to take decisions. The chair of the RCM LDF should take part in the Liaison Meeting.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends the relevant MS to attend the RCM LDF in future if the corresponding MS has a long-distance fishery in "Other regions" and to be equipped with the necessary data, background information and mandate to take decisions.	Relevant MS to attend the RCM LDF.

Complete consideration of fishing activities

SGRN repeatedly observed that some MS do not take all fishing activities under their flag into account when implementing sampling schemes within their NP. In the case of France, SGRN recommends that the Commission requests details about French fishing activities off Corsica (GSA 8), as France had been fishing in this area in previous years, but this area has not been considered in the French AR 2009 at all.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends that MS should take all fishing activities under their flag into account when implementing their NP.	European Commission to request additional information from MS in cases where fishing activities under the MS flag had not been considered in the respective NP (e.g. France: Corsica).

Reporting of landings vs. retained catches

As there are cases where catches are being retained but not landed (e.g. tuna cages), SGRN recommends using the term 'retained catches' instead of 'landings'.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends using the term 'retained catches' instead of 'landings' throughout.	European Commission, MS, SGRN.

RCM recommendations

SGRN 10-02 noted that the recommendations from the RCMs held in autumn 2008 are most relevant for the AR 2009, but the RCM 2009 recommendations have to be taken into account if they apply immediately after the meeting (autumn 2009).

The Liaison Meeting (LM) held after the RCMs provides a full list of RCM recommendations applicable to MS.

Precision estimates

Based on reported CVs, no MS was able to comply with DCF requirements regarding CVs. A revision of DCF requirements with regard to data quality should be considered in future SGRN meetings.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends a revision of DCF requirements with regard to target precision levels (CVs) to be achieved, as (yet) no MS has been able to reach any of the required CVs.	European Commission to ask SGRN for a review of DCF requirements with regard to CVs.

Fleet economics & transversal variables

SGRN evaluated the AR against the NP. In some cases NP were found to be incomplete (e.g. not all variables were provided). In this case, SGRN still commented on that issue, but did not consider it for the compliance class.

Table III.F.1 (transversal variables) was missing in the NP. Therefore SGRN was unable to thoroughly evaluate this table in the AR. Comments were made in case of evident drawbacks.

Tables III.B.1-3 (economic variables) and III.F.1 (transversal variables) contain columns for quality indicators which were not mandatory to be provided under NP2009-10. Therefore, “NA” has in all cases been applied as compliance class for quality aspects. If MS voluntarily provided quality data, SGRN still commented on the figures where appropriate.

SGRN was requested to evaluate follow-ups from RCM and international recommendations with respect to economic variables. A list of recommendations has not been provided, making the evaluation impossible. Moreover, as these recommendations do not have any direct implication on the collection of economic data for a single MS, this issue should be removed from the task list in the guidelines for the AR.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends follow-ups from RCM and international recommendations with respect to economic variables to be removed from the task list for NP and AR.	European Commission to have the guidelines amended accordingly by a STECF/SGECA working group.

For data which is mandatory to be collected under a different EU legislation, the evaluation of data quality should not be addressed under the DCF. This applies in particular to all capacity data, which are regulated under Commission Regulations (EC) No 2090/98 and No 26/2004, and to the data that are derived from logbooks and sales notes, which are regulated under Commission Regulations (EEC) No 2807/83 and (EC) No 500/2001, Council Regulation (EEC) No 2847/93, and Council Regulation (EC) No 1224/2009. The guidelines should be adjusted accordingly.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends that variables will be exempt from the evaluation of data quality under the DCF if they are gathered under another Commission or Council Regulation. This applies particularly to the fleet register, logbooks and sales notes/landings declarations	European Commission to adjust the DCF regulation and have the guidelines amended accordingly by a STECF working group.

The Commission Regulation (EC) No. 409/2009 is supposed to provide fish weight conversion factors, which would make Table III.F.1 redundant. As the regulation is not exhaustive at the current state, the figures which are lacking in the regulation should still be provided by MS.

SGRN is requested to evaluate AR achievements and deviations in comparison to the NP. It is not feasible for participants to compare all numbers in the related tables (III.B.1-3, III.F.1) during the meeting. This should be pre-processed through an automatic IT routine ahead of the meeting. The Commission is recommended to implement such a routine to run these checks in advance of the next meeting to increase the efficiency of the work, see recommendation on 'Automated scrutiny...' above.

During the evaluation process it turned out that for clarification, harmonisation and simplification purposes it is highly desirable to have updated guidelines regarding the following items (referring to Tables III.B.1-3):

The fleet segments should be aligned in the same order in both NP and AR.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends that fleet segments should be listed in the same order in both NP and AR.	European Commission to have the guidelines amended accordingly by a STECF/SGECA working group.

Nomenclature:

- The way how inactive vessels are displayed in the tables varies by MS. Some MS present them as “Inactive”, some MS as “Inactive+length class”, others include them in the “gear type+length class” segment. A standardised approach should be defined and applied.
- Fleet segments are not in all cases named homogeneously. In some cases, 3 letter codes are being used or added, in some cases clustered segments are not marked. It would be helpful if a comprehensive list of valid segment names were provided.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends that a standard nomenclature will be developed for NP and AR to display <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inactive vessels - fleet segments 	European Commission to have a standard nomenclature list developed by a STECF/SGECA working group.

Table III.B.1 (population segments): according to the guidelines, a range of numbers (e.g. for sampling rates) can be provided, combined with different collection schemes. The information which can be derived from this kind of display is rather limited, as it is unclear to which variables the figures refer to. Providing information for every possible combination of fleet segment, variable and collection scheme would, however, considerably increase the number of lines in the table. In this table it should also be considered if it is preferable to request these data for clustered or unclustered segments.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends clarifications on the way information on sampling rates, sampling schemes and the according figures has to be provided in Table III.B.1 of both AR and NP and if this information should refer to clustered or unclustered segments.	European Commission to have a STECF/SGECA working group to clarify and amend the guideline table templates accordingly.

Table III.B.3: the table should be organised exactly as table III.F.1 with respect to quality indicators. Therefore, there should be separate columns for bias indicators and variability indicators (and their values). This would also avoid having two different indicators (for bias and for variability) in one cell (as provided in the guideline template table III.B.3).

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends quality indicators and figures in Tab. III.B.3 to be presented in the same way as in Tab. III.F.1.	European Commission to have the guidelines amended accordingly by a STECF/SGECA working group.

Table III.B.3: some variables (e.g. capital value or FTE) are likely to be estimated or calculated on the basis of other variables. These variables might be collected under different data collection schemes with different quality indicators and values for measure of accuracy. In this case, it is unclear which indicators and values have to be provided. SGRN is asking for clarification by the Commission.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends to clarify in which way data collection schemes, quality indicators and related figures should be provided in Tab. III.B.3 in the case of variables which are calculated or estimated using other variables which might be collected under different collection schemes.	European Commission to have a STECF/SGECA working group to clarify and amend the guideline table templates accordingly.

Data quality of fleet economic variables

SGRN realised that even for the future AR 2010 the indication of quality indicators is not compulsory. However, in order to evaluate the quality of the MS analyses, it would be very

helpful to have these quality indicators available from all MS. SGRN strongly recommends MS to provide quality indicators in the upcoming ARs.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends MS to provide quality data in the 2010 AR even though they are not compulsory.	European Commission to inform MS accordingly.

From 2011 on, SGRN will have to evaluate quality figures. So far, it is not clear how this is expected to be done, e.g. for figure on achieved sample rates. The Commission is asked to have experts to develop an evaluation approach on quality figures.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends to clarify how quality figures should be evaluated in future NP and AR.	European Commission to have a STECF/SGECA working group to provide principles for the evaluation of quality indicators.

SGRN discussed the issue of inactive vessels. It was recommended to reconsider whether vessels without a fishing license should be excluded from the collection of economic data, as they are not able to participate in fishing (but maybe in aquaculture).

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends to clarify how to regard inactive vessels having no fishing license but being included in the national fleet register.	European Commission to have an STECF/SGECA working group to consider whether these vessels should be excluded from DCF.

Economic variables of the fish processing industry and aquaculture

In the data collection program, it is suggested that the segmentation of the fish processing industry should be according to the number of persons employed (SBS 16 11 0) in each enterprise (SGECA 08-01 Lisbon). Using the number of persons employed is not the common methodology used by the statistical offices in Europe, including Eurostat. It is, therefore suggested by Denmark that the segmentation should instead be according to the number of FTE employed in the enterprise (SBS 16 14 0). The Danish segmentation is based on the segmentation in Statistics Denmark, which is based on the number of FTE employed in the enterprise.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends an amendment to the Commission Decision 2010/93/EU, Appendix XII, regarding the number of enterprises in the processing sector. Enterprises should be segmented or specified by size category using number of	European Commission is requested to amend its DCF Decision.

FTEs in each enterprise instead of the number of employees in each enterprise.	
--	--

Denmark states: “Furthermore, the calculation of imputed value of labour is only relevant for small scale enterprises where the owner and his family are the main source of labour input, like in fisheries and agriculture production. The fish processing industry is not a small scale business in Denmark where the main labour input is based on the owner and his family. The value of imputed labour in Denmark is therefore non existing or insignificant. It is suggested that this parameter “Imputed value of unpaid labour” is left out of the data collection for the processing industry.”

SGRN remarks that “unpaid labor” is an issue in some Member States and therefore data should be further collected.

Table IV.A.2 and Table IV.B.2 in the standard tables for the AR ask for achieved sample number. Some MS are given figures on number of enterprises that responded to the survey, other give the number of enterprises to which they actually send out the questionnaire. This is a source of confusion and clarification are needed on what “achieved sample number” actually means.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends that the guidelines for the next AR should clearly state what is meant by ‘achieved sample number’ in order to avoid confusion.	European Commission to have the guidelines amended accordingly by a STECF/SGECA working group.

It was mandatory in the NP 2009/10 to present planned methods to assess data quality. The guidelines for the AR related to this NP have changes in the columns for data quality issues and the guidelines were said to be non compulsory for the data quality issues as those specific guidelines were introduced after the submission of the NP and shall be applied for the NP 2011-2013. The consequence is that most MS do not apply resp. report their proposed quality methods they were supposed to apply.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends that a sub-group on data quality should further clarify the guidelines on how MS should collect and present information for the proposed quality analysis from NP 2009/2010. The data for the calculation of the data quality indicators should be available for the Annual Reports 2010, therefore, SGRN recommends that the quality analysis introduced by the new guidelines should be made binding for the Annual Reports 2010.	European Commission should decide whether to make the guidelines on presenting data quality indicators binding for the AR 2010.

SGRN reminds that clustering of segments is not allowed in the regulation for aquaculture or processing industry. For reasons of comparability SGRN urged the MS to observe this rule.

Recommendation	Follow-up
----------------	-----------

<p>SGRN recommends that if additional variables not required in the regulation are collected by the MS they should be added at the end of the respective table. This is important to keep the order of the variables in the tables and ease quality checks and comparability of the data.</p>	<p>European Commission to have the guidelines amended accordingly by a STECF/SGECA working group.</p>
--	--

SGRN reminds MS that in the processing sector it is also mandatory to collect data on enterprises having fish processing not as their main activity.

Some MS report enterprises in aquaculture and fish processing that have temporarily stopped their business as non-responses. SGRN recommends that these enterprises should be considered as not being members of the population if they did not operate in the fish processing and aquaculture at any point of the respective year. In the case of overcoverage of the target frame, the target population should be corrected. This methodological issue should especially be considered in the case of non-probability sampling.

Cyprus states (AR, page 22): “Some problems may be encountered due to the fact that the definition of the processing industry/activities it is not explicitly defined in the Decision. For example glazing and re-packaging is not cleared whether they are defined as processing activities? The Cyprus National Statistical Service does not consider them as processing activities. This inconsistency creates some problems. The Working Group on Processing Industry and Aquaculture: Review of economic issues (Ispra 2006) did not clarify this issue. There was a recommendation from the 2006 RCM for the Mediterranean area for further guidelines on the definition of processing industry activities.”

This is not in line with the DCF regulation. The European Commission is asked to provide guidance to Cyprus on this matter.

COMMENTS BY MEMBER STATE

OVERVIEW

Based on the MS compliance levels from the evaluation of the MS Annual Reports, the following overview table was derived:

Member State	Biological variables	Economic variables	Transversal variables	Aquaculture	Processing industry
Belgium	Partly	No	No	No	No
Bulgaria	Partly	Yes	Yes	Mostly	No
Cyprus	Mostly	Partly	Mostly	Partly	Mostly
Denmark	Mostly	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Estonia	Partly	Mostly	Yes	Mostly	Yes
Finland	Mostly	Mostly	Yes	Mostly	Mostly
France	Partly	Mostly	Yes	No	Yes
Germany	Mostly	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ireland	Partly	Partly	Yes	No	No
Italy	Mostly	Mostly	Yes	Mostly	Mostly
Latvia	Mostly	Mostly	Yes	Mostly	Mostly
Lithuania	Mostly	Yes	Yes	NA	Mostly
Malta	Mostly	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Mostly
Netherlands	Mostly	Partly	Mostly	Mostly	Mostly
Poland	Mostly	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Portugal	Partly	Mostly	Yes	No	Mostly
Romania	Mostly	Mostly	Yes	Partly	Mostly
Slovenia	Partly	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partly
Spain	Mostly	Mostly	Mostly	Yes	Partly
Sweden	Mostly	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Yes
United Kingdom	Mostly	Yes	Yes	Yes	Mostly

BELGIUM

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Partly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Yes	
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Partly	No description of partners and no task specifications between partners are available
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Mostly	ICES WGCAN is claimed to be attended with "0" participants.
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Yes	
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	No major changes
III.B	Economic variables	No	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Table is incomplete e.g. (target population, frame population and planned sample rate, Achieved Sample no., Achieved Sample rate, Achieved Sample no. / Planned sampled no. are missing). MS is required to provide this information.
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Table is totally incomplete. MS is required to provide this information.
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	MS did not comply with the guidelines in reporting information. MS is required to check and provide correct information.
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	Since MS provided poor information in the TR (both tables and text), a

			comparison with what stated in the NP is not possible.
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	No	See comment above.
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
	REGION: North Sea and East Arctic +North Atlantic.		The region is not stated in the text.
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The column "Region" has not been filled.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	Some cells are not filled.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Used abbreviations are not explained.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Not completed.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	6 meters out of 12 were either not sampled or under-sampled
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	In general, no explanation is given in text for either too high or too low sampling intensity. TBB_MCD_>=120_0_0 is not sampled at all (10 samples expected) despite that it is stated in the text that "no deviations from NP are identified".
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	It is stated in the text that no deviations are identified but no CV's are provided in the table III.C.5.
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	No explanation is given
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	No list available.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Partly	Cooperation about ageing of sole is mentioned in AR
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	It is not possible to distinguish between

			shortfalls and deviations based on the text. Then MS states that there are no shortfalls.
	REGION: North Sea and East Arctic +North Atlantic.		The region is not stated in the text.
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		No sampling required according to the NP.
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	NA	
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	This should be clarified by the MS.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	No text is provided for that paragraph.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION: North Sea and East Arctic +North Atlantic.		The region is not stated in the text.
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The text is not by region. No CVs. No percentage given.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Not all cells are filled in. particularly, the achieved number of samples should be filled in (in the absence of percentages).
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	Some explanation given but not properly integrated in the A.R.
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	No explanation is given.
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	No text
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	No text

III.F	Transversal variables	No	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Table III.F.1 is inconsistent with the guidelines (e.g. Data sources, Type of data collection scheme). MS is asked to check and comply with the guidelines.
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	Ms did not provide sufficient information in both the TR and the NP, thus a comparison is not possible. MS is required to provide detailed information.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	MS did not provide this information and it is thus required to do so.
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	MS did not provide sufficient information in both the TR and the NP, thus a comparison is not possible. MS is required to provide detailed information.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	

III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea (one section for each survey!)		
	DYFS		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Achieved days at sea and achieved results not given
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	The survey is probably carried out according to the recommendations by WGBEAM but this is not stated in the text.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	BTS		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Achieved days at sea and achieved results not given
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	The survey is probably carried out according to the recommendations by WGBEAM but this is not stated in the text.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		

	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	No	SGRN recognises that MS has not collected any data for aquaculture sector in 2009.
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?		
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?		
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?		
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	No	SGRN recognises that MS has not collected any data for processing sector in 2009, despite what was stated in the NP. SGRN notices that this is the case for several years now. AR should refer to actions taken and not to actions planned. MS should redraft.
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?		
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?		

	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?		
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?		
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Table not complete. No time lag for data availability is given.
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	MS states: No major shortfalls
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	No explanation what "A" means in the table.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Assuming "A" is a positive indication.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	No deviation according to text
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	
General comments The report would gain by editing and investment of additional effort in order to become more complete. That counts for both tables and text.			

BULGARIA

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Yes	
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No	
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	All eligible meetings should be listed in the table.
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	NA	
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	No	SGRN appreciates that the MS is trying to comply with all the recommendations, but all relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM's should be listed in the text and the responsive actions detailed. MS to clarify
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	Same as previous comment
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	NA	Ms does not explain whether there are differences.
III.B	Economic variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table is mainly complete and consistent with the AR guidelines. Nonetheless, MS is asked to provide information on why the total number of vessels in the fleet register is higher than the total of the target population. This could be due to the lack of provision of information on inactive vessels. MS is asked to provide information on this point. MS is also asked to check and in case clarify why the planned sample number and planned sample rate are lower than achieved

			sample number and achieved sample rate.
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS does not cluster.
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table is not complete and not consistent with the guidelines. There is a very bad match between the "variable group" and the "variables". MS is asked to check this and amend the table accordingly.
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	NA	
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Two metiers are planned to be sampled. The OTM-MPD metier only achieved 60% of the planned trips.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	<i>Trachurus mediterraneus</i> , <i>Engraulis encrasicolus</i> , <i>Sarda sarda</i> are not sampled. CV not provided for any species
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	There are only two species reported in Table III.C.6. SGRN wonders if concurrent sampling has been carried out? Why are there no discard lengths, even though the MS carried out at sea sampling? MS to clarify this.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	<i>Trachurus mediterraneus</i> , <i>Engraulis encrasicolus</i> , <i>Sarda sarda</i> are not sampled.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Justification needs to be clarified. Did the MS receive

			the horse mackerel and anchovy data?
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	CV not evaluated for any species
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	The text wrongly refers to the Black sea recreational fisheries.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Mostly	MS should try to ensure that the NP proposal is implemented completely.
	REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	NA	They explain that they don't have recreational fisheries for the species listed in the DCF (eel, and large pelagics). MS to clarify
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Data for <i>Trachurus mediterraneus</i> , <i>Engraulis encrasicolus</i> are not sampled.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Data of <i>Trachurus mediterraneus</i> , <i>Engraulis encrasicolus</i> are not provided.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Justification needs to be clarified. Did the MS receive the horse mackerel and

			anchovy data?
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	MS should ensure the NP proposal is implemented as proposed
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	The text wrongly refers to the Black sea recreational fisheries. This should be clarified
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F	Transversal variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS reported "number of vessels" both under the capacity and the effort group of variables.
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	MS claimed that "There were no actions necessary to avoid shortfalls"
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP		

	proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	MS claimed that "There were no actions necessary to avoid shortfalls"
III.G	Research surveys at sea Bottom Trawl Survey (April – May)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The naming used in the TR should match the NP and the Appendix IX of the DCF. - Information about the relevant planning groups and international data bases is not provided. - The number of days of the survey exceeds the maximum eligible days (However, it match the number planned in the NP). MS to clarify
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained? (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea pelagic trawl survey (acoustic survey)		

III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The naming used in the TR should match the NP and the Appendix IX of the DCF. - Information about the relevant planning groups and international data bases is not provided. - The number of days of the survey exceeds the maximum eligible days (However, it match the number planned in the NP). MS to clarify
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained? (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea bottom trawl survey (Oct-Nov)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The naming used in the TR should match the NP and the Appendix IX of the DCF. - Information about the relevant planning groups and international data bases is not provided. - The number of days of the survey exceeds the maximum eligible days (However, it match the number planned in the NP). MS to clarify
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	

	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained? (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Sprat Acoustic Survey/Trawl		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	- The naming used in the TR and the NP should match Appendix IX of the DCF. - The survey was not carried out
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	The vessel to be used for the survey, had to be adapted for trawling and this was not completed on time. The MS should ensure that this situation is rectified for the coming years to ensure the survey can be completed.
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained? (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Ichthyoplankton pilot survey	No	This survey was planned in the NP, but not mentioned in the AR. SGRN notes that this survey is not eligible in the DCF. MS to clarify
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	SGRN recommends to update population numbers according to the actual number of the reference year in the AR.
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is asked to check the reference year in table IV.A.3 as it is unlikely to be 2009. Line 20 in table IV.A.3 refers to livestock cost, it should be livestock volume. MS to clarify. SGRN recommends MS clarify the difference between the data collection schemes mentioned in table IV.A.2 and IV.A.3. In the case of random sampling (B) an indicator of variability is necessary as well.
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	SGRN ask MS to clarify the mentioned RCM recommendation as MS refers to recreational fishery.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	No	SGRN recognises that MS has not collected any data for processing sector in 2009.
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	

IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	NA	
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	- Data to estimate indicators 8 and 9 are planned to be collected in the surveys (table III.G.1). SGRN requests the MS to clarify this. Also the term "large fish", does not refer to large pelagics only, as indicated by the MS. Also the MS has omitted indicator 6 from the table. MS to clarify.
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	No	SGRN appreciates that the MS is trying to comply with all the recommendations, but all relevant recommendations from

			STECF – SGRN should be listed in the text and the responsive actions detailed.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	Yes	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	
General comments SGRN knows that this is the second time that MS is reporting its TR, and recognizes the effort made to comply with the SGRN guidelines. However several issues need to be improved: - MS should list all the recommendations made by RCMs and STECF indicating the actions carried out to fulfil them. - The naming of the surveys used in the TR should match the Annex IX of the DCF - Deviations should be better explained			

CYPRUS

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Yes	
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	NA	Only one participating institute
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Mostly	Columns 5 & 6 to be modified by MS
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No	MS to update
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Mostly	Information on whether impact on NP was present was not stated.
III.B	Economic variables	Partly	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	MS provided information for 2009 and 2010 but not for the correct year (2008). MS is asked to clarify on this and take measures to correct this mistake. Considering 2009, table is mainly complete and consistent with the AR guidelines. Nonetheless, MS is asked to provide information on why the total number of vessels in the fleet register is higher than the total of the target population. This is probably due to the lack of provision of information on inactive vessels. MS is asked to provide information on this point. The inclusion of "new category" is not in line with the guidelines. MS is asked to comply.

	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table is complete and consistent with the AR guidelines.
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS used 2009 as reference year. MS is asked to check and provide correct information for 2008.
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	When referring to target population refers to the years 2011, 2012 and 2013. MS is asked to explain this. There is not perfect match between the figures provided in table III.B.1 in the TR and the figures provided in the same table in the NP. MS is asked to check this.
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	No	
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	Although not mandatory MS provided sound information in this table but not the Value of the accuracy indicator.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Mediterranean		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Lines concerning 2010 should be omitted
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN notes effort to compile table by MS
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Table to be filled in as most cells are empty, SGRN requests Table III.C.% to be resubmitted
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	No information on CV targets. To be clarified by MS

	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	MS could use other methods other than COST to estimate CVs at least for main target species
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Partly	Recommendations from SGRN and SGECA provided; no recommendations from RCMs
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	No text provided; MS to propose something to follow LPF sampling
	REGION Mediterranean Sea		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	NA	
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Explained for eel but not for BFT
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Mediterranean		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	CVs are not provided in some cases;
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	No biological sampling for most species; no biological data for large pelagics as proposed in NP; Refer to PGMED recommendation 2009 (sampling in 2010 and 2013)
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Deviations explained; justification not accepted
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Mostly	Some CVs missing
	Were CV targets met?	Mostly	discrepancy between text

			and table – text states that CVs have not been calculated at all, but there are some values present in the table; MS to clarify
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Deviations explained but not acceptable
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Partly	Recommendations from SGRN and SGECA provided; no recommendations from RCMs (no agreement on large pelagics)
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	For recommendations provided
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
III.F	Transversal variables	Mostly	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Ms is required to comply to the guidelines when defining the Type of data collection scheme (A, B or C). In case of census (A) sample rate is required in the Variability indicator (a).
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	

III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea MEDITS		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Formula for last column to be amended
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No	MS to provide map
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Partly	No description provided and no detail. MS to update
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Partly	
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	SGRN has doubts on whether the reference years are 2009 and 2010 respectively and asks the MS to clarify. The segments in table IV.A.II are not consistent with the information given on IV.A.I. MS is asked to clarify. MS should follow the order of the

			AR guidelines.
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	AR should refer to actions taken and not to actions planned. MS should collect data for variables listed in Appendix 10 of Comm. Dec 949/2008, not for variable groups (raw material costs and volume). MS should redraft.
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	MS to clarify for what years data have been collected.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is asked to clarify the reference year as 2009 seems to be implausible. In case of a Census achieved sample rate should be 100%, the response rate could differ, but all should have received a questionnaire or be contacted for an interview. MS is asked to amend the information according this.
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is asked to clarify the reference year as 2009 seems to be implausible. Type of error should be bias. The data source e.g. for energy costs is maybe not financial accounts. MS to clarify.
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	MS is asked for clarification on this.
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	

IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Text is not relevant for AR; it is the text used for the NP. MS to modify
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	MS to resubmit table
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	MS to clarify
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Data calls, GFCM not mentioned; MS to update
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	No	Provided in the other sections. MS to input in this section.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Mostly	No reference to SGRN and SGECA reports
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	NA	For Biological sub-group
General comments -Table of contents to be amended (the one for NP proposal is given instead of the AR) AR was difficult to follow by sub-group. It was evident that the final text was not reviewed and there was mixing and repetition of sections Processing and Aquaculture (additional comment): Cyprus states (AR, page 22): "Some problems may be encountered due to the fact that the definition of the processing industry/activities it is not explicitly defined in the Decision. For example glazing and re-packaging is not cleared whether they are defined as processing activities? The Cyprus National Statistical Service does not consider them as processing activities. This inconsistency creates some problems. The Working Group on Processing Industry and Aquaculture: Review of economic issues (Ispra			

2006) did not clarify this issue. There was a recommendation from the 2006 RCM for the Mediterranean area for further guidelines on the definition of processing industry activities.”
This is not in line with the DCF regulation. The European Commission is asked to provide guidance to Cyprus on this matter.

DENMARK

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Yes	
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Partly	There is no description of national coordination meeting. Regularly coordination meeting take place through electronics communication techniques.
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No	Reason for not attending several meetings was not given.
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Mostly	Changes in 2008 described in detail.
III.B	Economic variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	DRB VL1012 was not presented separately in the NP. The name of some segments is confusing and not consistent. MS is asked to check the correctness of segments names. (e.g. [DRB] [VL1224] Dredges: 12-18 m, [TBB] [VL1218] Beam trawlers: 18-24 m (Shrimp trawlers)). Total target population in table III.B.1 does not add up with total population in fleet register this is partly due to the fact that a segment for inactive vessels is missing from table III.B.1, MS is required to add this to the table.

	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	<p>Table is complete and consistent with NP but in some clustered segments the prerequisites for clustering are not met (e.g. there is more than one segment that amounts to more than 10 vessels). MS is asked to clarify. MS is asked to clarify on the clustering procedure followed for the Dredges 12-18 m (clustered) segment in that there is inconsistency between the TR and the NP. MS clustering procedure is described (and mostly in line with the NP) but not in line with the regulation. MS is asked to comply with the regulation.</p> <p>MS is asked to comply with the regulation regarding "Classification of segments which have been clustered" in that "C" is not a correct option.</p>
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	<p>In table III.B.3 it is not clear if "all segments" include inactive vessels or not, MS is asked to clarify as this is important for the analysis on capital value. MS is asked to clarify on the data source as there appear to be inconsistencies also with respect to what is stated in the NP (e.g. Imputed value of unpaid labour).</p> <p>Although the provision of information on "Type of data collection scheme" was not mandatory, MS is asked to check consistency with the information provided for the same item in table III.B.1. MSs were not asked to provide information on "Type of data collection scheme", "Type of error", "Accuracy indicator" and "Value of the accuracy indicator".</p> <p>Nonetheless, MS filled in these columns and the evaluators spotted some general errors regarding "Type of error" and "Accuracy indicator".</p> <p>Example 1: if data are collected by census then bias is a potential error.</p> <p>Example 2: variability of</p>

			estimates is not an appropriate measure of accuracy, CV would be. MS is asked to check and comply with the regulation.
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	The figures for planned sample number provided in the TR do not correspond to those provided in the NP. MS is asked to follow up.
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	Yes	MS provided an explanation but not a justification.
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	Since the provision of measure of precision was not mandatory, this question cannot be evaluated.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	Since the provision of measures of precision was not mandatory, this question cannot be evaluated.
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Baltic Sea		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN appreciates MS efforts, as this table was not required in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	A total 11 metier were covered, 4 metiers were undersampled.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	No explanation for over-sampling is given, neither financial implications.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	Information in text and tables is not consistent. Table does not contain any CV.

III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Sea and Eastern Arctic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN appreciates MS efforts, as this table was not required in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	A total of 39 metiers were sampled, undersampling was observed in 11 metiers.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	No explanation for over-sampling is given, neither financial implications.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	Information in text and tables is not consistent. Table does not contain any CV.
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN appreciates MS efforts, as this table was not required in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Fishery (except 1trip) did not exist in this region in 2009.

	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	NA	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	Yes	A document that describe the sampling and estimates of the recreational fisheries of cod and eel was also submitted by the MS.
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	There is no information about data quality issues.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Baltic Sea		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	A total of 24 metiers were sampled, undersampling was observed in 13 metiers.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	No explanation for over-sampling is given, neither financial implications. A large number of combinations of stock and variables (6) were sampled but not planned in the NP proposals. No explanation is given.
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		

	Have CVs been provided?	Partly	32 combinations of stock and variables, CV calculated for 13, CV achieved for 4 only
	Were CV targets met?	Partly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Sea and Eastern Arctic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	A total of 83 combinations of stock and variables were sampled, undersampling was observed in 15. No explanation for over-sampling is given, neither financial implications.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	A large number of combinations of stock and variables (37) were sampled but not planned in the NP proposals. No explanation is given.
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Partly	From 114 necessary CV calculations, 49 were made.
	Were CV targets met?	Partly	Target met for 14 variables.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	There is inconsistency between text and tables, the text seems simply pasted from previous areas.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	No catches for Blue Whiting.
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		

	Have CVs been provided?	NA	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F	Transversal variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS is required to revise the type of data collection scheme to make it consistent with the actual definition (A,B or C). Since the request for derogation in the NP have been approved then MS should include this comment in the AR. MS should not provide incomplete information on variables that are exempted from collection (e.g. if information on a variable is NA then it is wrong to provide info on the data source).
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	

III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3	Landings		
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
III.F.3.1	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea: Baltic International Trawl Survey, HAVFISKEN; 1st Quarter		
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
III.G.1	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Achieved target 82 %
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea: International Bottom Trawl Survey; 1st quarter		
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
III.G.1	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Achieved target 88 %

	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea: International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea, 2nd Quarter		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Achieved target 74 %
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea: International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea, 2nd and 3rd Quarter		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Achieved target 46%
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		

	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea: Nephrops TV survey (FU 3&4), 2nd and 3rd Quarter		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	achieved target 60%
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G	Research surveys at sea: Baltic international Trawl surveys, International Bottom trawl survey, North Sea Sandeel Survey, Herring larvae survey (6 surveys in total)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	Incorrect quarter number mentioned in maps for BITS 4-quarter surveys
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic		

	situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Yes	.
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	.
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The variable "capital value" is missing. MS to clarify.
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Yes	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is asked to add the "Capital value" with the necessary information.
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	It is unclear, if MS has collected the mandatory data. It refers to an investigation of the issue of may having a lot of fish processing in multi-activity enterprises. SGRN appreciates this effort, but asked for clarification if DCF requirements concerning data collection for non NACE-10-30 enterprises have been fulfilled.
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	

	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	It is not clear why data are not collected according to this table, while they are according to the text. MS to clarify and resubmit the table.
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls	NA	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	NA	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	NA	
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	
General comments			
None			

ESTONIA

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Yes	
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No	
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Partly	Several working groups planned in the NP are not in the TR (WGBAST, WGBIFT, NAFO SC). MS to clarify
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No	
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	Partly	Recommendations should be listed in this section
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Partly	Recommendations and responsive actions should be listed in this section. MS to clarify.
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	No changes.
III.B	Economic variables		
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table is complete but not completely consistent in that the clustered segment "Pelagic trawlers; 40m or larger" contains two segments with less than 10 vessels each. MS is asked to check this and to comply with the guidelines.
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table is complete and consistent. MS did not list variability in the "type of error" when type of data collection scheme is C. MS should also provide indicator of variability as a measure of accuracy. In the future MS will have to comply to the guidelines and provide this

			information.
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	No	Although there were not significant deviations with respect to the NP, MS is asked to provide more detailed information in the text of the TR.
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	The provision of this information was not mandatory. Nonetheless, given that the NP and TR do not contain much information it is hard to make comparisons. In the future MS is asked to describe quality targets more thoroughly.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	See comment above.
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Baltic Sea		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The total number of trips achieved in 2009 are not provided. MS to clarify.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	CV values are not reported in Table III.C.5
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	- III.C.3: 4 metiers out of 6 are undersampled - III.C.5: 6 species out of 12 are undersampled and 7 species are oversampled - Although there are a number of metiers sampled at sea, no discards sampling was carried out. MS to clarify.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	MS Says that under sampling is as a result of over sampling of other species.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP		

	proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Mostly	The actual CV's achieved for unsorted catches should be provided.
	Were CV targets met?	Partly	- 6 out of 13 are OK. - 4 CV's cannot be evaluated because the exact value is not provided. MS to provide the CV's.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN appreciates MS efforts, as this table was not required in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The CV values are not provided for unsorted catches
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	- III.C.3: one metier is oversampled - Although there are a number of metiers sampled at sea, only <i>Sebastes</i> sp. was sampled for discards
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Partly	The CV values are not provided for unsorted catches
	Were CV targets met?	Mostly	- 2 CV's out of 5 do not reach the targets
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	- The deviations explained in the text (eel and pike) are not listed in the tables for the Atlantic. MS to clarify.
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Partly	Explanation provide is not relevant to this region, but should appear under the Baltic section (pike, eel and costal stocks)
	REGION Baltic		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	Yes	The recreational fisheries text refer to "North Atlantic - (eastern Baltic Sea)". SGRN requests the MS to clarify this.
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Baltic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	- 19 stocks out of 50 are undersampled - 20 stocks out of 50 are oversampled
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	"National sampling are at low level to get accurate estimates". MS to clarify.
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and	Yes	

	acceptable?		
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	- 3 out of six required precision target are not provided
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	- 5 stocks out of 9 are undersampled - 3 stocks out of 9 are oversampled
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	The MS says: "All data will be transferred to NAFO Scientific Council who will assess the quality of the data internationally" But this is not a valid reason for not calculating and reporting cv's. MS to clarify.
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Partly	Action refers only to maturity, no actions proposed for the other biological parameters. MS to clarify.
III.F	Transversal variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table is complete but not consistent with the guidelines in that "exhaustive" is not acceptable as measure of achieved variability.
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		

III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	Table III.F.1 was not provided in the NP so comparisons are not feasible.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	MS did not provide any information on this point thus NA has been applied.
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	Table III.F.1 was not provided in the NP so comparisons are not feasible.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Baltic International Trawl Survey, BITS Q4		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	The number of days achieved was 40% and the number of hauls achieved was 67%
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	None given. MS to clarify.
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	The survey maps must be labelled more clearly and separated. The BITS and the Baltic International Acoustic Surveys are presented in one survey map.

III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained? (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No	- Nothing is explained about the results of the survey and the impact of only achieving 67% of the hauls on the quality of the survey results. MS to clarify.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Baltic International Acoustic Survey (Autumn)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	See previous comment on survey map.
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained? (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Gulf of Riga Acoustic Herring Survey		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	

III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained? (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	No evaluation of the representativeness has been made
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Yes	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	No information available
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	Yes	No evaluation of the representativeness has been made
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	

IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Indicators n° 6 and n° 7 and n° 9 are missing. Effective time lag column should be completed for all indicators.
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Data transmission to Working Groups (AFWG, WGBFAS, WGWIDE and WGDEEP) should be detailed in the table.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Data transmitted to the RCM only according to Table VI.1. Additional data transmission is evident in the ICES database. SGRN Requests that the MS resubmit this table to correctly reflect their data transmission.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	However, the list is very short
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	No	
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main	NA	

	text?		
General comments - CV should be estimated and the final value presented in the tables - Deviations from the NP should be better explained - MS should clarify why the discard sampling is almost absent, having a number of trips sampled at sea.			

FINLAND

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Yes	
II.	National data collection organisation	Yes	
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	
II.B	Regional and International coordination	Yes	
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings	Yes	
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Yes	
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	MS says the recommendations were taken into account...How? MS to clarify
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	
III.B	Economic variables	Mostly	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	The frame population should contain values and not text 'not applicable'. The codification provided by the guidelines should be used for the column where the type of data collection scheme is provided. The value of the planned sample no. for the segment 'Pelagic trawlers: 18-24 m' does not correspond to the type of data collection scheme. It is not clear why the achieved sample number for some of the segments is greater than the target population.
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	It is not clear what 'Not applicable' in the column regarding the classification of segments which have

			been clustered means.
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	'Profits (EBIT)' was included in the table but is not requested by the DCF. The codification provided by the guidelines should be used for the column where the type of data collection scheme is provided. The type of error column is completed incorrectly. The column of the 'Accuracy indicator' is not correct as "census" and "precision level" are not what was requested. It was not always possible to evaluate the value of the accuracy indicator as the type of accuracy indicator is not clear.
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	NA	
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	Since the provision of measure of precision was not mandatory, this question cannot be evaluated. Additionally, the type of data collection scheme is not clear.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Mostly	Actions to improve the reliability of the cost items mentioned should be implemented.
	REGION Baltic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The examples were not deleted from the table. Also 3 of 7 metiers were undersampled.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	50% (4 out of 8) of stocks

	guidelines?		are undersampled. E.g. Esox lucius only reached 25% of planned sampling levels.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	Deviations are well explained and justifiable (human error, species distribution changes etc...)
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Yes	
	Were CV targets met?	Partly	3 out of 8 stocks reached the required precision levels.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	Deviations are not explained.
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	MS Only said they will reduce planned sampling numbers for Salmo trutta, no other actions explained for under sampling and cv's. MS to clarify
	REGION Baltic		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	Yes	
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	No shortfalls
	REGION Baltic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		

	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Salmo trutta, Clupea harengus(area 31) were both under sampled.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Yes	SGRN appreciates the effort of the MS in calculating cv's for each age and for all variables as outlined in the attached amended Annex 1. However the shortfalls for all species are not detailed in the main report. MS to clarify.
	Were CV targets met?	Mostly	cv targets achieved for 28 out of 31 variables (length at age/weight at age, and sex ratios per species).
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	Recommendations not listed.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	The MS says all recommendations have been taken into account.
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Partly	Actions only described for salmon. No actions outlined for sea trout or herring. MS to clarify.
III.F	Transversal variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	The data source in the TR text and TR table is not clear (not consistent). The codification provided by the guidelines should be used for the column where the type of data collection scheme is provided. The description of the variability indicator is not according to the guidelines. Some of the effort variables and one of the landing variables (average price per species) are missing.
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	

III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Baltic International Trawl Survey.		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Finnish scientists participated in the survey on board the Danish research survey vessel. Details to be found in the Danish AR
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	NA	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		

	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Baltic International Acoustic Survey (Estonia and Finland)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Achieved 80% of days at sea and 69% of hauls for the BIAS
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Mostly	MS says the timing of the survey has been changed in previous years? This is unclear. SGRN requests more clarification on this issue.
III.G	Research surveys at sea Baltic International Acoustic Survey (Sweden and Finland)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		

	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	No recommendations
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS should clarify the absence of a marine water segment despite its being mentioned in the NP. SGRN recommends that MS includes frame population in the table and codes the Collection scheme as "A" as stated in the guidelines.
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	SGRN recommends that additional economic variables not requested in the DCF be added at the end of the table to improve comparability. It is also recommended to use the categories stated in the guidelines to refer to data quality indicators.
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	It remains unclear what actions will be taken to correct the described shortfall. MS is asked to clarify
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	SGRN recommends that MS includes frame population in

			the table data and codes collection scheme under A as stated in the guidelines.
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	SGRN recommends that additional economic variables not requested in the DCF be added at the end of the table to improve comparability. It is also recommended to use the categories stated in the guidelines to refer to data quality indicators
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Availability timelines for discards and fuel efficiency of fish capture are not in Table V1. some information is in the text.
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	The examples were not deleted from the table.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	

VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	NA	No comments
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	
General comments			
The report was well written, concise and in general complied with the SGRN guidelines.			

FRANCE

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Yes	
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	No	The attendance column is blank in Table IIB1. Ms to resubmit the table.
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No	No reasons are supplied in the text
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	No	MS says it has "nothing to report". MS to clarify.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	NA	No changes highlighted.
III.B	Economic variables	Mostly	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Total target population in table III.B.1 does not add up with total population in fleet register this is partly due to the fact that a segment for inactive vessels is missing from table III.B.1, MS is required to add this to the table. SGRN reminds MS that the data established in the regulation for setting the population of active vessels must be the January 1 st in the year the data refers to, and not December 31 st of the previous year as stated in the NP. The reference year for this table does not coincide with the one stated in the NP. MS to clarify
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	MS to clarify if any clustering has taken place

			<p>In Table III.B.3, it is not clear if “all segments” include inactive vessels or not, MS is asked to clarify as this is important for the analysis on capital value.</p> <p>MS is asked to clarify on the data sources as there appear to be inconsistencies also with respect to what is stated in the NP (e.g. sale slips).</p> <p>The reference year in this table does not coincide with the one stated in the NP. MS to clarify.</p> <p>MSs were not asked to provide information on “Type of data collection scheme”, “Type of error”, “Accuracy indicator” and “Value of the accuracy indicator”.</p> <p>Nonetheless, MS filled in these columns and the evaluators spotted some general errors regarding “Type of error” and “Accuracy indicator”.</p> <p>Example 1: if data are collected by sampling then variability indicator should be provided.</p>
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	Yes	
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	Since the provision of measure of precision was not mandatory, this question cannot be evaluated.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	Since the provision of measures of precision was not mandatory, this question cannot be evaluated.
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Sea and Eastern Arctic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	Partly	Total no. of trips during the

	guidelines?		sampling yr is blank for the most part. There are no planned or achieved numbers of trips for self sampled metiers. In the North Sea, 7 of 10 proposed metiers did not reach planned sampling targets. There are 3 derogations highlighted in Table III C3? Naming of regions is inconsistent, i.e. North East Atlantic v North Atlantic. MS to clarify if the derogations for sampling were granted.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Naming of regions is inconsistent, i.e. North East Atlantic v North Atlantic. The total number of fish measured column does not tally with the no's sampled. Cv's only reported for Merluccius merluccius, and even here the fishing grounds identified do not correspond with the North Sea and Eastern Arctic (IIIa, IV, VI, VII and VIIIab).
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	But no species group is provided.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Problems in III.C.3 and III.C.5
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Some explanations for deviations are provided. However there are a lot of inconsistencies in the tables which need to be corrected.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	Only for one stock
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	MS says that they have calculated CV's and presented this work to RCM's and other workshops, however they are not reported in the AR.
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	RCM not titled but assume this is the NS as the recommendations say NS. No year for the RCM is provided.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Partly	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and	Yes	

	acceptable?		
	REGION North East Atlantic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Naming of regions is inconsistent, i.e. North East Atlantic v North Atlantic. Total no. of trips during the sampling yr is blank for the most part. There are no planned or achieved numbers of trips for self sampled metiers. In the NE Atlantic, 3 metiers were not sampled at all. 6 metiers which were identified for self sampling were also not sampled at all. 3 of 37 proposed metiers did not reach planned sampling targets (between 6% - 31%). There are 9 derogations highlighted in the table? MS to clarify if the derogations for sampling were granted.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Naming of regions is inconsistent, i.e. North East Atlantic v North Atlantic. The achieved no. of fish measured is virtually blank. CV's for landings/retained catches is virtually blank, apart from Cod VIIe – k. CV's are provided for only 10 out of 42 stocks.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	But no species group is provided.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Problems in III.C.3 and III.C.5
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Some explanations for deviations are provided. However there are a lot of inconsistencies in the tables which need to be corrected.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	Some CV's are provided but none of them reach the required precision levels.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	MS says that they have calculated CV's and presented this work to RCM's and other workshops; however they are not reported in the AR.

III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	RCM not titled but assume this is the North Atlantic as the recommendations say NA. No year for the RCM is provided.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Partly	Responsive action refers to a pilot study which the MS says is available in the transversal variables section. However no pilot study results are available in this section of the AR.
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Total no. of trips during the sampling yr is blank. One metier out of 11 is not sampled at all (PS LPF). One out of 11 is under sampled (37%) DRB.Mol.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The achieved no. of fish measured is blank. CV's for landings/retained catches is also blank. Only the CV for precision for Merluccius for discards is reported. MS reports sampling of 2080 individual bluefin tuna, however this does not tally with table III.C.3 where the MS does not report any sampling trips for large pelagics.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Only two metiers are reported in Table III.C.6 OTB-CRU and TBB-DEF. Neither of these metiers appears in Table III.C.3. Table III.C.3 contains 11 metiers for which no sampling is reported in Table III.C.6 MS to clarify
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Problems in III.C.3, III.C.5 and III.C.6 making it difficult to evaluate.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	No explanations in the text.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	CV's are provided for one out of 7 stocks, and even

			then only for discards. It does not reach the required precision levels.
	Were CV targets met?	No	MS says that they have calculated CV's and presented this work to RCM's and other workshops; however they are not reported in the AR. MS to clarify.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	RCM MED and BS in 2008 recommended to MS to include details of Bi – Lateral agreements for biological sampling of Blue – fin tuna in cages. No details have been provided by the MS. MS to clarify.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Indian Ocean (IOTC)		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Sampled two metiers for large pelagics PS- LPF and LLD-LPF. The targets for the Purse seiner fleet was not reached but was sampled to 85%.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	The list of species for IOTC is repeated in the table – we presume one of these lists should be labelled 2010? There is no information regarding sampling at the regional level of species where France collaborates with other MS in the IOTC region. MS to clarify 5 stocks out of 15 stocks were not sampled at all.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	No market sampling totals from long liners are presented in Table III.C.6, the note says they are waiting for IFREMER to provide the data. SGRN recommends to the

			MS to resubmit this table.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Problems in III.C.3, III.C.5 and III.C.6 making it difficult to evaluate.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	No explanation is provided for the zero market sampling for LLD-LPF metier.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	No cv's are provided.
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	1st RCM including IOTC region was held in February 2010.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	Yes for sampling explanation but no for the lack of cv's.
	REGION Central – Eastern Atlantic (ICCAT)		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	The list of species for ICCAT is repeated in the table – we presume one of these lists should be labelled 2010? There is no information regarding sampling at the regional level of species where France collaborates with other MS in the ICCAT region. MS to clarify. 5 stocks out of 15 stocks were not sampled at all.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	1st RCM including IOTC region was held in February 2010.

	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	No actions proposed for non sampling of species in this region, especially for swordfish or bluefin tuna. MS to clarify.
	REGION Central Western Atlantic (WECAF)		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	No mention of WECAF in Table III.C.3 although it is mentioned in the text, and 4 metiers were planned to be sampled in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	No cv's reported. Considerable over sampling of Penaeus subtilis, planned 3,000 and achieved 11, 996, an over sampling of almost 400%
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	The region described is "Other Regions" but this does not include WECAF. MS to clarify.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Only table III.C.5 is completely correct.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	1st RCM for this region took place in 2010.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
	REGION: NAFO		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	3 Metiers for the NAFO region were selected to be sampled for "other reasons" in the MS NP. However no sampling is recorded in Table III.C.3 MS to clarify.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	Planned to sample Gadus

	guidelines?		morhua only. The MS had a target to 1,500 individuals and they achieved 183 which is only 12%. No explanation is provided for this under sampling in the text. MS to clarify
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	NAFO is not reported on in Table III.C.6 MS to clarify.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
	REGION All Regions		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	Yes	
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	Mostly	No sampling of Eel in 2009. MS to clarify
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North and Eastern Artic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	No biological variables were reported for Merluccius merluccius, although they were planned. 17 of the 38 planned stock variables

			were under sampled (less than 90%).
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	No cv's are provided.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Partly	Information provided on a quality system for protocols and calculation of cv's only.
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	19 stocks out of the 59 planned to be sampled in 2009, had zero sampling for one or more variables. In the text details are provided for eel and salmon length and age sampling. However neither of these species appear in Table III.E.3 MS to clarify
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Explanations provided for only some of the deviations. Further clarification required from MS.
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	None have been reported.
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Partly	Information provided on a quality system for protocols and calculation of cv's only. MS to clarify.
	REGION Mediterranean		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		

III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Mostly	Recommendation re bluefin tuna sampling was over looked by the MS. See previous comment re RCM recommendation. MS to clarify.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Partly	Information provided on a quality system for protocols and calculation of cv's only.
	REGION: Indian Ocean (IOTC)		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	No data for Thunnus obesus. Also no cv's are presented. MS to clarify.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	1st RCM for this region took place in 2010.
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION: Central – Eastern Atlantic (ICCAT)		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	For the two stocks planned to be sampled, Thunnus obesus achieved 92% and Thunnus albacares only

			reached 66%
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	1st RCM for this region took place in 2010.
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Central Western Atlantic (WECAF)		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	No mention of the WECAF area under "Other Regions" in Table III.E.3 however shrimp sex ratio sampling for shrimp species are highlighted in the text. MS to clarify.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	1st RCM for this region took place in 2010.
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION: NAFO		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Gadus morhua in Table III.E.3 reports that 999 individuals were sampled for length at age, but in Table III.C.5 there are only 183 lengths reported for this species. This must be a mistake? MS to clarify.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP		

	proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F	Transversal variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	France has requested for several derogations and pilot studies in the NP and they have been approved. However, SGRN recommends that the variables subject to derogations and pilot studies will be left empty to improve consistency.
III.F.1	Capacity	Yes	
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.F.2	Effort	NA	
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.F.3	Landings	NA	
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		

	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G	Research surveys at sea IBTS 1st Quarter.		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained? (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Western IBTS 4th Quarter. (EVHOE).		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained? (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and	NA	

	acceptable?		
III.G	Research surveys at sea Sardine, Anchovy, Horse mackerel, Acoustic Survey. (PELGAS).		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained? (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Pan-Mediterranean pelagic survey MEDIAS - PELMED.		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	In original NP proposal, only 500 Nm was planned (instead of 2100 that appear in current Table III.G.1)
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained? (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Mediterranean international bottom trawl survey - MEDITS.		

III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained? (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Blue whiting survey.		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	See Dutch AR. Multilateral agreement in RCM-NA 2008
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	NA	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained? (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	No	SGRN recognises that MS has not collected any data for aquaculture sector in 2009. MS has to follow the DCF regulation.

	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is asked to further clarify why the reference year is 3 years behind the year of data collection. MS is also asked to fill in the respective tables.
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is asked for more information why the reference year in table IV.A.3 is 2008 and 2009 and 2006 in table IV.A.2. The data collection schemes in table IV.A.3 should be consistent with table IV.A.2. The reference year should be the same for all variables.
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	Even if promised in the NP, no data for production volume and employment are presented. MS to clarify on this.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Yes	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	The achieved sample number for all the population does not correspond to the sum of the segments.
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS is asked to add the variable "No. of enterprises".
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	Yes	SGRN appreciates that MS has collected data for enterprises having fish processing not as their main activity.
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	

	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	The table is blank apart from the indicator titles. However full details are supplied in the text.
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Mostly	No responsive action to one of the STECF recommendations listed.
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	NA	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	No	
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No	The text says that the results of a pilot study on landings, value and effort conducted in 2007 are attached as an annex, however this not the case – MS to provide the missing annex.
General comments			
1. There is no mention of Corsica throughout the report – the MS must clarify which fisheries are taking place in this area, and if any sampling was undertaken in Corsica.			

2. The naming of the regions is inconsistent between tables in the report. This can be quite confusing.
3. The Ms is encouraged to resubmit all III.C and III.E Tables, as there were many errors and omissions, which made evaluation of the report very difficult.
4. RCM recommendations need to be clearer. The MS should highlight which RCM and in what year the recommendations were made.
5. Virtually no CV's were calculated across all modules. The MS should calculate the cv's and report as requested in their AR.
The attendance column is blank in Table IIB1. Table V.1 was also blank. Ms is requested to resubmit the tables.

GERMANY

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Yes	
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No	MS did not attend 4 of the planned 29 meetings. No explanation is given.
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	No	MS list the RCM's it is involved, not their general recommendations
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?		
III.B	Economic variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS is requested to clarify the reason why the achieved sample number/ planned sample number for the following segments is low: Beam Trawlers 0-10m, Beam Trawlers 24-40m and Drift and/or Fixed Netters 24-40m (no statistical coverage). Additionally, the segment for inactive vessels is not included in table III.B.1 but is illustrated in the TR text.
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	It is not possible to link the value of the accuracy indicator for several variables to the corresponding segment. MS is asked to clarify.
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		

	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	Yes	MS is asked to clarify the reason why in the TR there has been an introduction of another supra region (other regions) in the segment "Pelagic Trawlers > 40m".
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	Since the provision of measure of precision was not mandatory in the NP, this question cannot be evaluated.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	Since the provision of measure of precision was not mandatory in the NP, this question cannot be evaluated.
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION BALTIC SEA		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN appreciates MS efforts, as this table was not required in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	Financial implications of oversampling not explained.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	CV provided only for cod lengths.

	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	MS is currently implementing the COST tool in order to be able to give all required precision estimates in the future.
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Sea and Eastern Arctic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	"See text" is not in accordance with the guidelines.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN appreciates MS efforts, as this table was not required in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	A total of 12 metiers were sampled, undersampling was observed in 7 metiers. 'Additional sampling' (=not required by DCF) was carried out for 4 species/areas.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	Financial implications of oversampling were not explained.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	MS is currently implementing the COST tool in order to be able to give all required precision estimates in the future
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP		

	proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	"See text" is not in accordance with the guidelines.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN appreciates MS efforts, as this table was not required in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	A total of 2 metiers were sampled, 1 was undersampled. 'Additional sampling' (=not required by DCF) was carried out for 4 species/areas.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	Financial implications of oversampling were not explained.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Partly	CV's provided for 5 species/areas out of 16
	Were CV targets met?	No	CV target met in 1 species/areas out of 5
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	MS is currently implementing the COST tool in order to be able to give all required precision estimates in the future
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Other regions -LDF		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN appreciates MS efforts, as this table was not required in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	Trips were planned but not carried out.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	No German fishery for Sardinella in CECAF area. The sampling of fishery for Jack Mackerel in South Pacific area will be arranged multilaterally in RCM LDF.

III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	NA	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	No RCM Long-distance fisheries took place in 2009 or before
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION BALTIC SEA		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	Yes	
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION NORTH SEA AND EASTERN ARCTIC		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	NA	MS states: "No activities planned and no activities realized. A pilot study for eel is in preparation". MS to clarify.
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	

III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Baltic Sea		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The naming of regions and fishing grounds does not follow the guidelines.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	5 out of 28 variables undersampled 'Additional sampling' (=not required by DCF) for Eel and Sprat.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	Financial implications of oversampling not explained.
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	CV's provided only for 2 out of 28 stocks (Cod).
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	MS is currently implementing the COST tool in order to be able to give all required precision estimates in the future.
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Sea and Eastern Arctic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	The naming of regions and fishing grounds does not follow the guidelines. Several stocks are presented in the same line in column 'Area / Stock'. Required precision targets are not given.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	10 out of 36 variables undersampled. 'Additional sampling' (=not required by DCF) was carried out for 5 stocks (data used in assessment).
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	Financial implications of oversampling not explained.
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	

	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	MS is currently implementing the COST tool in order to be able to give all required precision estimates in the future.
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	The naming of regions and fishing grounds does not follow the guidelines. Several stocks are presented in the same line in column 'Area / Stock'. Required precision targets are not given.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	11 out of 28 stocks undersampled. 'Additional sampling' (=not required by DCF) was carried out for 3 stocks.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	Financial implications of oversampling not explained.
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	MS is currently implementing the COST tool in order to be able to give all required precision estimates in the future.
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Other regions -LDF		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	NA	

	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.F	Transversal variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	NA	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	Since the provision of data quality was not mandatory in the NP, this question cannot be evaluated. The NP states that the data on effort of vessels < 8m using passive gear will be compared with catch per unit effort data from vessels with logbook obligation. In case of evident deviation, data will be checked with the submitting person, if possible: If not, data will be adjusted to a value close to the average. The TR does not report any type of data quality check.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	Since the provision of data quality was not mandatory in the NP, this question cannot be evaluated.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Demersal Young Fish Survey (DYFS)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Achievement 84% in days and 76% in fishing hauls
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	Shortfalls due to bad weather conditions
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G	Research surveys at sea International Redfish Survey (REDNOR)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	Survey not carried out
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	Only Norway participated in this new survey in 2009.

	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	NA	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Herring Larvae Survey (IHLS) January		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Achievement 50% in days and 18% in ichthyoplankton hauls
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	Shortfalls due to an injury of a crew member (2 days) and bad weather conditions (3 days)
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Greenland Groundfish Survey (GGS)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Achievement 68% in fishing hauls
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	Shortfalls were due to bad weather and heavy ice conditions in the survey area
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP		

	proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Baltic International Trawl Survey (BITS), Baltic International Acoustic Survey (BIAS), Sprat Acoustic Survey (SPRAS), Rügen Herring Larvae Survey (RHLS), International Bottom Trawl Survey (IBTS), North Sea Beam Trawl Survey (BTS), International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Seas (ASH), North Sea Herring Acoustic Survey (NHAS), International Redfish Survey (REDTAS), Blue Whiting Survey, International Mackerel and Horse Mackerel Egg Survey (MEGS), Herring larvae survey (IHLS) in September.		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Shortfalls under the margin of 10%
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Yes	
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP		

	proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Yes	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	During 2009 no work took place but in 2010 actions were taken
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	

	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Yes	MS is referring to 5 general STECF recommendations
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	NA	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	
General comments			
None.			

IRELAND

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Partly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Yes	
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?		
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?		
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	Yes	No need to list recommendation related to specific sections. There are no recommendations from RCM NS&EA
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	
III.B	Economic variables	Partly	Two relevant tables are missing.
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	The table does in many respects not comply with NP and the guidelines. To be corrected and resubmitted by MS
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	The table does in many respects not comply with NP and the guidelines. To be corrected and resubmitted by MS
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The reference year should be 2008. Variable groups should be named in accordance with the regulation. In case of a census, the type of error should be bias. "None" is not an appropriate accuracy indicator.
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP	No	As two relevant tables are

	proposal?		missing, no thorough evaluation is feasible. The relevant data and information provided is consistent. The AR text should focus on changes from the NP. General methodology should be provided in the NP.
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	No	As two relevant tables are missing, no thorough evaluation is feasible.
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	In the future, data quality indicators should be provided in accordance with the guidelines.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	The table is not filled, an explanation is given in the text.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Supra - region header shall be in accordance to appendix II Com Dec. 2008/949/EC. It is not possible to distinguish between North Atlantic, North Sea and Eastern Arctic (fishing grounds combined) so impossible to evaluate achievement of length sampling.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	Only 6% of the metiers and sampling strategy combinations planned were achieved
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	Operational problems are not a valid explanation.

			No explanation is given in case of FPO and SSC metiers. In general MS indicated a problem with human resources. This is not considered as a valid explanation. SGRN recommends resubmitting the Tables.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Partly	
	Were CV targets met?	Partly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	Recommendations were listed in point II.B.2
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	Actions were listed in II.B.2
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Sea and Eastern Arctic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Supra - region header shall be in accordance to appendix II Com Dec. 2008/949/EC. It is not possible to distinguish between North Atlantic, North Sea and Eastern Arctic (fishing grounds combined) so it is impossible to evaluate achievement of length sampling.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	No metiers has achieved more than 90% of the planned trips.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	No explanation is given. SGRN recommends resubmitting the Tables.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		

	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	Yes	
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	There is no sampling of seabass.
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Supra - region header shall be in accordance to appendix II Com Dec. 2008/949/EC. It is not possible to distinguish between North Atlantic, North Sea and Eastern Arctic (fishing grounds combined) so it is impossible to evaluate achievement of stock – based sampling.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	See comments above.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	See comments above. SGRN recommends resubmitting the Tables.
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Yes	It is not possible to distinguish between the areas.
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	Precision targets are achievable with very large

			sample. To be discussed at RCM NA.
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	Recommendations listed in point II.B.2
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	Actions listed in II.B.2
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Sea and Eastern Arctic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Supra - region header shall be in accordance to appendix II Com Dec. 2008/949/EC. It is not possible to distinguish between North Atlantic, North Sea and Eastern Arctic (fishing grounds combined) so it is impossible to evaluate achievement of stock – based sampling
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	See comments above. SGRN recommends resubmitting the Tables.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	NA	See comments above.
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F	Transversal variables		
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS asked to provide all variables as provided in Appendix VIII of the regulation. MS is asked to fill in “none” for variability indicators in the future in the case of a census.
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	

III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea (this applies to all surveys)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	UWTV in July achieved only 67% due to bad weather.
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	

III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	The recommendations are derived from the survey planning group and not from RCM.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	See above
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	No	No data has been collected
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	No	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	No	No data has been collected
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	No	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	Yes	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	
General comments			
None.			

ITALY

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Yes	
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	NA	
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	
III.B	Economic variables	Mostly	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table is complete and consistent with the AR guidelines. Nonetheless, MS is asked to provide information on why the total number of segments in table III.B.1 in the TR is different than the number of segments in table III.B.1 in the NP. The segment purse seiners >40 m is reported in the NP but not in the TR.
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table is complete and consistent with AR guidelines but in some clustered segments the requirements for clustering are not met (e.g. there is more than one segment that amounts to more than 10 vessels). MS is asked to justify the clustering procedure implemented for the following clustered segments: Dredgers 12 - 18 m *, Purse seiners 12 - 18 m

			*, Vessels using hooks 12 - 18 m *, vessels using polyvalent "passive" gears only 12 - 18 m *.
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	It is not clear if table III.B.3 includes information on inactive vessels or not, MS is asked to clarify as this is important for the analysis on capital value.
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	MS is asked to clarify on changes in planned sample size in table III.B.1.
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	No	MS is asked to clarify on changes in planned sample size in table III.B.1.
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	Since the provision of measure of precision was not mandatory, this question cannot be evaluated. Nonetheless, MS provided information on measures of precision. In the future MS should report values of accuracy indicators for each segment of the fleet separately.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	Since the provision of measures of precision was not mandatory, this question cannot be evaluated.
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Mediterranean Sea		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	The order of presentation of the metiers selected should be consistent in Table III.C.1 and III.C.3
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN appreciates MS efforts, as this table was not required in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	A total of 57 metiers were sampled, undersampling

			was observed in 9 meters. Achieved number of trips is larger than the planned ones, although the MS did not mention if this had consequences on the costs.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	MS did not explain the reason for around 200 more trips than those planned. Also, MS did not provide information for undersampling.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Partly	
	Were CV targets met?	Partly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	No explanation is given on why CV was not estimated for several meters.
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	No action for estimating CV is foreseen. MS to clarify.
	REGION Other regions		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	There is an inconsistency between the text and tables. From the tables, no sampling seems to be planned for the CECF areas while from the text the opposite seems to apply.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	NA	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	Mostly	There is no mention of the level of landings for blue fin tuna from recreational fisheries. Some more information about the eel sampling would be beneficial.
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Mediterranean Sea		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	A total of 136 combination of species and variables were sampled, undersampling was observed in 12 combination of species and variables. Achieved samples are larger than the planned ones, although the MS did not mention if this had consequences on the costs.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	No explanation is given on why CV was not estimated for all stock variables.
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	Table III.E.3 do not report long term planning as stated in the text.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	

III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Other regions		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	There is an inconsistency between the text and tables. From the tables, no sampling seems to be planned for the CECAF areas while from the text the opposite seems to apply.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	NA	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F	Transversal variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Although not mandatory, MS provided partial information on measures of precision. In the future MS should report values of accuracy indicators for each segment of the fleet separately.
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		

	Were data quality targets met?	NA	Although not mandatory, MS provided partial information on measures of precision. In the future MS should report values of accuracy indicators for each segment of the fleet separately.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	Although not mandatory in the NP, MS provided partial information on measures of precision. In the future MS should report values of accuracy indicators for each segment of the fleet separately.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea (Answer here apply to all surveys carried out by the MS)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		

	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	No information available
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		

	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Mostly	It seems like SGRN reports 2006 and 2007 are referred here instead than 2009. To be clarified by the MS.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	NA	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	
General comments			
None.			

LATVIA

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Yes	
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Mostly	MS should list all the planned meetings, not only the ones they attended
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Yes	
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	
III.B	Economic variables	Mostly	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table is complete and consistent with the AR guidelines.
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table is complete and consistent with the AR guidelines.
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table is consistent with the AR guidelines but it is not complete. MS is required to provide information on "imputed value of unpaid labour"
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	In the NP MS claims that information on "imputed value of unpaid labour" is not reported in accounts. MS is required to provide information on "imputed value of unpaid labour".
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	Mostly	MS is required to provide information on "investments" and "financial position".

III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	Since the provision of measure of precision was not mandatory, this question cannot be evaluated. Nonetheless, MS correctly provided information on measures of precision.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Baltic Sea		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	SGRN notes that sampling years for species Sprattus sprattus and Stizostedion lucioperca may be wrong (MS says 2010, 2011).
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	- table III.C.3: one metier out of 7 undersampled - table III.C.5: two stocks out of ten undersampled, and three stocks out of ten oversampled - Few species are sampled for length in each metier. SGRN wonders if concurrent sampling has been carried out. MS to clarify.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Mostly	- From the retained catches, 3 CV's out of ten are missing - From discards, 1 CV out of 3 is missing - From discard volume, 2 CV out of 3 are missing
	Were CV targets met?	Mostly	- 3 CV out of 10 (provided) do not reach the target
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		

	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - III.C.3: one metier out of two was undersampled, and one metier out of two was oversampled - III.C.5: the two sampled stocks are oversampled. Sebastes spp was highly oversampled (784%) - Few species are sampled for length in each metier. SGRN wonders if concurrent sampling has been carried out. MS to clarify.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Mostly	- 1 CV out of 3 was not provided
	Were CV targets met?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	- MS should explain why the CV for Sebastes spp retained catches was not reported, especially considering the significant over sampling of this species. MS to clarify.
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	No shortfalls to note
	REGION CECAF		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	NA	MS asked for a derogation to

	guidelines?		not sample CECAF region in 2009. MS to clarify if this derogation was granted.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	NA	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Baltic Sea		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	Yes	
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	There are no shortfalls to note
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	NA	No recreational fisheries in the Atlantic.
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	

	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION CECAF		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	NA	There are no recreational fisheries in the North Atlantic
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Baltic Sea		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	- 10 variables out of 43 are under sampled. 10 variables out of 43 are oversampled
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Mostly	- 20 CV's out of 45 are not estimated and appear as NA (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i> , <i>Perca fluviatilis</i> , <i>Psetta maxima</i> , <i>Salmo salar</i> , <i>Salmo trutta</i> and <i>Stizostedion lucioperca</i>)

	Were CV targets met?	Mostly	- 16 CV's out of 45 do not reach the target
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	There are no relevant recommendations for this section
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	- no sampling has been carried out for Sebastes sp. age - MS should report the number of otholiths collected, as stated in the guidelines. - Pandalus biological sampling is oversampled. 4 out of 8 stock variables were not sampled at all.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	No cv's have been calculated.
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION CECAF		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	The MS says they have derogation to not sample in CECAF region. MS to clarify if this derogation was granted.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	NA	

	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F	Transversal variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	Not mandatory.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	Not mandatory.
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	

	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Baltic International Trawl Survey, BITS Q1		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Baltic International Trawl Survey, BITS Q4		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Baltic International Acoustic Survey (Autumn)		

III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	The MS only achieved 44% of the planned fishing hauls.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	Bad weather can not be anticipated, so no actions are proposed.
III.G	Research surveys at sea Gulf of Riga Acoustic Herring Survey		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea Sprat Acoustic Survey (SPRAS)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	The SPRAS survey does not appear in Table III.G.1
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	The SPRAS survey was not performed in 2009, due to financial reasons.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	MS's should ensure when

			possible the completion of the NP proposal. However, SGRN considers the choice of survey that had to be dropped is logical and justifiable.
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Mostly	SGRN recognises that MS has not collected any data on aquaculture, as it is not mandatory for fresh water species. But for Salmon it is mandatory and MS stated in table IV.A.1 that there is salmon aquaculture in Latvia. MS to clarify.
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		.
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?		
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?		
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?		
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is asked to clarify why they name a planned sample

			of 100% random sampling and not census.
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is asked to clarify why they name a sample with 100% coverage rate random sampling and not census.
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	MS is asked to clarify why it does not collect data on unpaid labour. Even if the National Statistical Office does not provide the data they can collect them by their own.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	It is unclear, if MS has collected the mandatory data. MS to clarify.
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	It is unclear what is meant in this paragraph. MS to clarify.
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	- data transmission to AFWG, WGWIDE was not reported (comparison made with ICES data base). MS to clarify.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Yes	

	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	No	
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	
General comments The report was well written, concise and in general complied with the SGRN guidelines.			

LITHUANIA

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Mostly	MS refers to old regulations.
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No	There is no description of national coordination meeting.
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No	MS did not attend WGBFAS, which is the most relevant WG for Lithuania.
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	
III.B	Economic variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Achieved sample rate should be provided as a range, in compliance with the achieved sample no.
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Clustering scheme has been changed for vessels using passive gear, should be explained by MS
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	No collections schemes and accuracy indicators should be provided for variables which are not applicable (ref. to fishing rights)
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	MS should provide information basically if it different from or in addition to NP
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	NA	
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	

III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Baltic Sea		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	Formulas of achievements were not referring to the right column.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	5 of 9 of the metiers planned were undersampled.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Yes	
	Were CV targets met?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	Recommendations on ageing should be moved to stock related variables. Discards issue is also misplaced.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Sea and Eastern Arctic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN appreciates MS efforts, as this table was not required in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	There were no fisheries in 2009.

III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	NA	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN appreciates MS efforts, as this table was not required in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	There is an inconsistency between information in the tables and those in the text. One trip was sampled according to the text, but it was not achieved according to the Table.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Yes	
	Were CV targets met?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Other regions		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN appreciates MS efforts, as this table was not required in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	

	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	Financial costs are not considered as a valid explanation.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	NA	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Baltic Sea		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	Yes	
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	There is no mention of eel and salmon sampling, neither if derogation has been granted.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?		
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
	REGION Baltic Sea		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Yes	

	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	There is no remedy listed to increase precision level.
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	Recommendations on ageing should be reallocated here from the metiers section.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION North Sea and Eastern Arctic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	No fisheries in 2009.
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	NA	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	Only <i>Sebastes</i> spp. was sampled.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Excess sampling was not justified.
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Yes	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Other regions		

III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	Financial costs are not considered as a valid explanation.
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	NA	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	Financial costs are not considered as a valid explanation.
III.F	Transversal variables		
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	

III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea (this section refers to all surveys)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	NA	No data has been collected and the reason according to the NP is that all aquaculture in LI are freshwater species.
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP	NA	

	proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	It seems that the questionnaire is not a census (A) because it is not sent to all companies, but B or C.
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	No information available
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	The table is not filled.
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	The table is not filled.
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	

	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	Financial costs or administrative issue are not considered as a valid explanation.
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	No	Here the MS should refer to general STECF recommendations. Also, the format is not according to the guidelines. Answers to the recommendations are also not clearly stated.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	NA	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	
General comments None.			

MALTA

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Yes	
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	NA	
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Yes	MS explains non-attendance with unforeseen circumstances as surveys. This is not a valid explanation.
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	
III.B	Economic variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS is requested to ensure consistency of total no. of vessels with fleet register in the future (AR: 1309, FR 1374); Ms is requested to follow the segmentation as provided in the NP
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is requested to fill in all cells for "Variable group". Not all variables are named according to Reg. 949/2008 (e.g. "crew wages"); – MS requested to provide several missing variables (e.g. FTE variables); MS requested to provide accuracy indicators in line with guidelines in the future
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		

	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Text on “achievements” is actually provided under “data quality”
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	NA	
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	Since the provision of measures of precision was not mandatory, this question cannot be evaluated.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is not providing total number of sampling trips during sampling year. MS to provide respective values.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN appreciates MS efforts, as this table was not required in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Tables III.C.5 include not relevant comments from MS government. MS to send the final version of the tables.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	A total of 5 metiers were sampled, under-sampling was observed in 1 metier.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	The over-sampling as well as under-sampling case are explained by MS.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Yes	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	MS describes the methods of sampling and CV calculations and states that despite the excessive sampling intensity, the precision level still did not meet the required level.
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	See comment above.
	REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	Yes	
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	MS explains non-sampling of Bluefin tuna in recreational fishery with catch and release programme established for the recreational fishery of BFT in 2009.
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	No actions are planned by MS states that catch and release programme will be in force also in 2010
	REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	MS claims that sampling of stock related variables was planned since 2010 in NP. However the Table III.E.2 of TR as well as the NP proposal text and Table III.E.3 indicate that the sampling of stock related variables was planned for 2009 as well. The table III.E.3 of TR indicates that no length sampling was planned, however the respective NP table indicates that the length sampling was planned for 2009. Information in the tables were not provided by MS. SGRN is not able to evaluate the compliance level. Also, table III.E.3 is

			inconsistent with the same table in NP. MS to resubmit the table.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	MS claims that despite of sampling of stock-related variables in 2009 was not planned. MS still sampled specimens for stock-related variables so as "to be able to implement better the data collection for stock-related variables in 2010". This statement remains unclear.
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Yes	The CV target levels are wrong.
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F	Transversal variables		
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Bias indicator and value are not provided (not mandatory). CV values presented are all identical (20%), which is very unlikely. MS should provide information according to the guidelines in the future.
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	MS should only describe adjustments to the NP and not present issues in the AR which should be part of the NP
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	

III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea (Mediterranean International Trawl Survey - MEDITS)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea (Mediterranean Acoustic Survey - MEDIAS)		

III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Level of achievements is wrongly calculated. MS to send it back to EC.
	Are the achievements consistent the NP proposal?	No	1. Days at sea exceeded the planned value (325%) 2. Achievement of targets was 1100%.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	No explanations of excessive survey are given in TR. MS to present the respective information.
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	MS does not explain the shortfalls in 2009 MEDIAS
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	SGRN recommends that the total population be updated to exclude inoperative firms. SGRN also recommends that census data collection scheme be coded under A as stated in the guidelines.
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is asked to include variables instead of just variable groups as stated in the guidelines
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	MS is asked to include variables instead of just variable groups as stated in the guidelines (Table IV.A.3)
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	SGRN recommends to use coverage rate as a quality target for census as stated in the guidelines
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		

	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Mostly	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is asked to include variables instead of just variable groups as stated in the guidelines
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	MS is asked to include variables instead of just variable groups as stated in the guidelines (IV.B.2)
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	It remains unclear whether the MS has collected the referred data. . MS is asked to clarify.
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		

	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No	There is no reference in the TR text to the tables provided in Annex B (a ,b ,c).
General comments			
None.			

NETHERLANDS

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Yes	
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No	Nothing mentioned in the text. Only in table II.B.1.
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	NA	No non-attendances
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	
III.B	Economic variables		
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS reported 2009 as reference year for some segments. MS is asked to check this and comply to the guidelines. The definition provided under "Type of data collection scheme" is not correct. MS is asked to comply.
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Although MS described the clustering process in the TR, she did not provide any information in this table. MS is asked to complete the table with the information they have available.
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	The provision of accuracy indicators was not mandatory. Nonetheless, in the future MS is asked to be clearer on the information provided under "Value of the accuracy indicator".
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP	Yes	

	proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	NA	
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	In the future MS is asked to be clearer on the information provided under "Value of the accuracy indicator".
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION: North Sea and East Arctic +North Atlantic.		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Not filled in. The MS argues that the table is inconsistent and that the table needs to be revised in order to comply with the purpose of the table.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Deviations are explained but not justified. The fishery in IIIaN is not sampled (and not supposed to be according to the NP). However, the missing sampling from that fishery is understandable as it seems to be a NS fishery extending to the IIIaN.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	no	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and	Yes	

	acceptable?		
	REGION: Other Regions.		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Region not included
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	Region not included
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Not filled in. The MS argues that the table is inconsistent and that the table needs to be revised in order to comply with the purpose of the table.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Region not included.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	NP states that "No sampling will be carried out".
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	Options to implement sampling programs are currently under preparation.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	NA	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	REGION: IV and VIId and ICES I and II		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	Partly	Data collected for cod. No data collected for eel.
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	No explanation given for eel.
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	

III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	No explanation given for eel.
	REGION: North Sea and Eastern Arctic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	CVs are calculated in almost all relevant cases mentioned in the NP.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Yes	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	yes	
	REGION: North Atlantic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	CVs are only calculated for few variables and few cases.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Partly	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Mostly	Recommendations were listed under the NS section
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Partly	Part of the recommendation is not relevant for the MS. This would have been nice if that had been specified.
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	yes	
	REGION: Other Regions.		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		

	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Region not included.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	NP states that "No sampling program has been included in the NP 2009".
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	NA	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F	Transversal variables		
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The table is complete but not consistent with the guidelines. Under "Variability indicator (a)" census is not an acceptable information. MS is asked to comply with the guidelines. MS is asked to explain why NA is reported in some rows under the "Region" column.
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	

III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea (one section for each survey!)		
	Survey: IBTS I Q		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No	Only planned stations are indicated on the map and it is not put in the main body of the report.
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	Based on table III.G.1.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	Only minor deviations
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	No recom.
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	Survey: BTS		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	

	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	No recom.
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	Survey: DYFS		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations.
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Partly	It is not indicated if the map shows planned or achieved stations.
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations.
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	No recomm.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	Survey: SNS		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations.
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Partly	It is not indicated if the map shows planned or achieved stations.
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	

	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations.
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	No recomm.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	Survey: ASH		For this survey only references are given to the Danish A.R.
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	See comment above.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	See comment above.
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No	See comment above.
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	NA	The MS is not responsible for indices maintenance.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	Survey: IHLS		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Partly	It is not indicated if the map shows planned or achieved stations.
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	Survey: NHAS		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No	It is most likely that it is the planed stations which are indicated (Map identical to the map provided in the NP).
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	Survey: Blue whiting Survey		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No	Only the planed survey tracks are indicated.
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is asked to further clarify why the reference year is 2

			<p>years behind the year of data collection. MS is asked for more information why the reference years are 2006 and 2007.</p> <p>SGRN appreciates MS has tried to collect data for freshwater species. SGRN remind that data collection is mandatory for marine species, eel and salmon, independently from the technique or location of the enterprise.</p> <p>For the segment “other marine fish” it remains unclear if MS did not achieve to collect data due to non-response or to the enterprises stopping production. MS to clarify.</p>
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is asked for more information why the reference years in table IV.A.3 are 2007 and 2008 and why it is inconsistent with table IV.A.2.
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS is asked to clarify why a 100% sampling in table IV.B.1 is not named “Census”.
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is asked to clarify the different reference years in table IV.B.1 and IV.B.2. Furthermore the data sources should be further detailed according to the text of the AR. This refers also to the accuracy indicator and its value.
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		

	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	It is unclear, if MS has collected the mandatory data. MS is asked to clarify.
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	MS states: No major shortfalls
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	Yes	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No	Bilateral agreements should be limited to NP and the maps on survey

			performance should be included the body text of the report.
General comments Some principle decisions have to be made concerning monitoring of fisheries which is very difficult/impossible to access (e.g. distant fisheries).			

POLAND

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Mostly	No indications regards changes
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No	
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Mostly	3 meetings that were not attended (written in text) were not listed
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Yes	
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	Mostly	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Partly	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Mostly	Impact on NP implementation not described. MS to update.
III.B	Economic variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table is consistent and complete. MS is asked to check and provide information on the reasons why achieved sample number is zero for the segments "Vessels using hooks 12-18m" and "Inactive".
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table is complete but it is not clear why the MS clustered "Vessels using hooks 12-18m" in the clustered segment "Drift and fixed netters 12-18m" since 15 vessels are sufficient to represent an independent segment.
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	In column "Accuracy indicator (c)" estimation and all data are not acceptable information. Ms is asked to check this and comply with

			the guidelines. MS is asked to clarify why the provision of information on some economic variable is not relevant (e.g. Accuracy indicator (c), Value of quota and other fishing rights) . MS is asked to provide the names of the segments and not their abbreviations in column "Fleet segments (d)".
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	NA	
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Baltic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Total no. of trips missing. MS to up-date
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	CVs are not provided; '?' to be removed and updated from columns; NP year and TR year to be inserted
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	NP year and TR year to be inserted; 2 nd column to be filled in by MS
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Number of samples achieved for some species are less than planned; Group 3 species data not present, MS to clarify sampling methods
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		

	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Mostly	format used not as in guidelines
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Partly	Not enough description provided
	REGION North Sea & Eastern Arctic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Total no. of trips missing. MS to up-date
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	CVs are not provided; '?' to be removed and updated from columns; NP year and TR year to be inserted
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	NP year and TR year to be inserted; 2 nd column to be filled in by MS
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Number of samples achieved for some species are less than planned; Group 3 species data not present, MS to clarify sampling methods; 2 metier were planned but only 1 sampled
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Other regions		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Total no. of trips missing. MS to up-date
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	CVs are not provided; '?' to be removed and updated from columns; NP year and TR year to be inserted

	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	NP year and TR year to be inserted; 2 nd column to be filled in by MS;
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Baltic		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	Yes	
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	MS to clarify
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Mostly	The relevant RCM recommendation related to WKSMRF should be listed. Move from general recommendation to here
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION All regions		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Information missing
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	Numbers planned for 3 of the species not achieved; the objective of the sampling is not known
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	No information on parameters; Justification not acceptable for eel fishery
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP		

	proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	MS to clarify
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	MS to update; move from General framework to this section
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	MS to update
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.F	Transversal variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	

III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea All surveys		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Map references not in table
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	Provided in Annex
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	MS to make note when section is not applicable
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	No	SGRN recognises that MS has not collected any data for aquaculture sector in 2009. MS has to follow DCF regulation.
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		.
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?		
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?		

IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?		
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Yes	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is asked to add the variables "imputed value of unpaid labor" and "number enterprises" (by size category) to the variable list and the respective content of the lines.
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	Yes	
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	No text in relevant section but explained before
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Inconsistencies between text and tables about economic data
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Mostly	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	No	MS to input reference list
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	
General comments The AR gives information on the data collected but does not cover data quality issues and no information on national database. The report is well-structured by region. However, MS is asked to strictly follow guidelines in the sections of 'Follow-up of regional and international recommendations' so as to facilitate evaluation			

PORTUGAL

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Yes	
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Partly	No description of partners and no task specifications between partners are available
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No	No national coordination meetings was held
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No	WKARA and WGCEPH not attended and not explained.
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	No	No list is provided.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	
III.B	Economic variables	Mostly	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	In some of the segments the planned sample rate and the type of data collection scheme are not consistent. The codification provided by the guidelines for the type of data collection scheme is not respected. It is not clear why the planned sample rate for several segments is equal to zero. Additionally, it is not clear why in some cases the planned sample rate is zero and the corresponding achieved sample rate is greater than zero. Evaluators have cross checked the target population with the number of vessels in the fleet register and have found a large discrepancy which is

			probably due to the fact that the inactive vessels were not included in the target population.
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The table was not fully completed (e.g. fleet segments column). Additionally, it is not clear why in some cases the value of the accuracy indicator is given as a range.
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are there deviations from the NP proposal?	Mostly	Table III.B.1 - The type of sampling strategy between the NP and TR are not consistent in some cases. Table III.B.2 - It is not clear why the amount of vessels clustered in most of the segments is significantly different when comparing the TR and the NP.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	Partly	Table III.B.3-The type of data collection scheme and the sampling strategy for most of the segments do not correspond, therefore it was not possible to evaluate data quality.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION: North Sea and East Arctic +North Atlantic + Other regions		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		The report should be reconstructed in accordance with DCF regions.
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Table should follow the guidelines.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN appreciates MS efforts, as this table was not required in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	CVs are missing
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP	Mostly	6 metiers out of 19 is under-

	proposal?		sampled.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Not all deviations are explained. However, considering the complexity of the fishery it is not possible to describe all deviations in details within the frame of the A.R.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Not possible to evaluate deviation (no CVs). MS states that COST is in the process of implementation.
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	Given text not relevant. No list provided.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	MS will increase sampling.
	REGION: North Sea and East Arctic +North Atlantic + Other regions		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		Some aspects are described in the NP but no plans for data collections were given there. The A.R repeats these considerations but does not provide any new relevant information. MS should clarify if any recreational fisheries occurs and if so what data were collected in 2009.
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	No	
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	No information given.
	REGION: North Sea and East Arctic +North		

	Atlantic + Other regions		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The variables for each species should be given in individuals lines. No CVs are given.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Many significant deviations of the combination of stocks and variables are not explained.
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Not possible to evaluate deviation (no CVs). MS states that COST is in the process of implementation.
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Partly	Only shortfalls concerning CV calculations are given.
III.F	Transversal variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The variability indicator in the case of census should be not applicable. Many fields of the table are incomplete.
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are there deviations from the NP proposal?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are there deviations from the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	

III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are there deviations from the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea: FCGS		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS should inform that the MS only participate with 3 scientific staff members in the survey conducted by Spain.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	Not mentioned but it is assumed that agreed standards are maintained.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	Assuming that the 2009 survey was carried out by Spain and in agreement with agreed protocols.
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	No list provided.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	Not possible to decide on as no list is provided
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	As no shortfalls is identified in the text.

	Western IBTS 4th Q		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Mostly	The sampling activity is not directly reflected by the maps supplied. The maps are not in the main body.
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	Not mentioned but it is assumed that agreed standards are maintained.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	No list provided.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	Not possible to decide on as no list is provided
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	As no shortfalls are identified in the text.
	Sardine, anchovy and horse Mackerel acoustic survey		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Mostly	The sampling activity is not directly reflected by the maps supplied. The maps are not in the main body.
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	Not mentioned but it is assumed that agreed standards are maintained.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	No list provided.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	Not possible to decide on as no list is provided
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	As no shortfalls are identified in the text.
	Nephrops UWTV offshore survey (FU 28-29)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	

	guidelines?		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Mostly	The sampling activity is not directly reflected by the maps supplied. The maps are not in the main body.
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	Not mentioned but it is assumed that agreed standards are maintained.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	No list provided.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	Not possible to decide on as no list is provided
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	As no shortfalls are identified in the text.
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	No	MS states that is has permitted derogation for collecting the required data. Commission to clarify
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	.
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP		

	proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Data collection by the National Statistical Office has not been implemented by now. MS to clarify when it will happen. Response rate is far beyond 70%. MS is asked how it deals with the problem of representativeness.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	It is unclear, if MS has collected the mandatory data. MS to clarify.
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Mostly	SGRN remarks that fish processing data had to be collected for many years already. The mentioned not updated database of enterprises therefore occurs as a too simple explanation for the low response rate. MS to clarify. MS may apply a sampling data scheme if census with a sufficient response rate is not achievable.
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Status of the derogations for indicators 5, 6 and 7 should be checked
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		

	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	No	No list provided.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	MS states: "all recommendations were carried out".
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Mostly	List incomplete.
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	Could be improved by some minor editorial changes.
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		The maps on survey performance should be included the body text of the report. An extensive description of the Eel pilot study is given.
General comments Considering the complexity of the fishery, the report meets the requirements with some minor deficiencies except that the report is not structured according to the DCF regions. The MS uses its own area definition, which is not in line with the guidelines and should be changed in the future.			

ROMANIA

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Yes	
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Partly	No information on RCM, PGMED and other groups relevant for the supra region
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Yes	
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	Partly	Only recommendations from Sofia meeting (meeting recommended during RCM Med&BS 2008)
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Partly	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	
III.B	Economic variables	Mostly	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Type of collection scheme should be characterised through 1 letter (A, B or C). The achieved sample rate and ratio are not calculated correctly. Total numbers not in line with the AR text.
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	"Passive gears:set gillnet: <6m" is not clustered and should be excluded from the table. Total numbers not in line with the AR text. MS recommended to consider clustering within length classes instead of gear type.
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Reference year should be 2008. Type of collection scheme should be characterised through 1 letter (A, B or C). List of variables is incomplete. Fleet segments are not indicated correctly. All to be

			provided by MS. Value of accuracy indicator is calculated incorrectly.
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	AP text should focus on achievements and deviations rather than on procedures, which should be provided in the NP.
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	NA	
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Mediterranean & Black Sea		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Discrepancies between text and tables on concurrent sampling at sea
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	No data on discards provided for concurrent sampling at sea
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Only Group 1 species were listed and no information on length sampling of discards. MS to clarify
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Except for concurrent sampling at sea
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Mostly	No CVs for discards or landings provided. MS to clarify how CVs of discard volumes were obtained
	Were CV targets met?	Partly	Actual CVs to be provided. MS to clarify
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Not clear from text the methodology that was used for data gathering and estimation of CVs
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	

III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Mediterranean & Black Sea		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	NA	
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Yes	MS to clarify whether derogation was granted
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Mediterranean & Black Sea		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS to clarify CV calculations; Trachurus spp. to be separated into the 2 species
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Yes	Difficult to understand why CVs obtained are the same for all species
	Were CV targets met?	Yes	MS to clarify the methods
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	MS is to clarify
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
III.F	Transversal variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	List of variables is incomplete (e.g number of hooks). To be provided by

			MS. Indication of variability indicator, achieved variability bias indicator and value of bias indicator is inappropriate. MS should provide correct information in future.
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea All surveys		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP		

	proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Partly	
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	The reference should be 2008
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	No evaluation of the representativeness has been made
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	No	Low response rate
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	The reference year should be 2008
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		

	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	No information available
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	Partly	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Indicator number 6 is missing
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	No	MS to update
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	Yes	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Partly	No reference to RCM reports and STECF reports
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		Yes
General comments SGRN notes the effort made by Romania for the compilation of the AR. The AR is well-written, however more clarifications on methods used need to be provided.			

SLOVENIA

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Mostly	No information on changes/difficulties presented
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Mostly	Role of partners not defined
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No	
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Partly	Inconsistencies between years (2009 and 2010); Some eligible DCF meetings are missing; to be clarified by MS.
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No	
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	NA	
III.B	Economic variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Fleet segment column should be clearer. Abbreviations are to be avoided.
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	No clustering done.
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are there deviations from the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	Since the provision of measure of precision was not mandatory, this question cannot be evaluated. Additionally, the type of data collection scheme is not

			clear.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Mediterranean		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Total no. of trips given was the number of planned trips not total number of trips in 2009 for each metier
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	MS has provided details on achievements and is acknowledged by SGRN
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Is MS conducting concurrent sampling scheme? Only two stocks are documented and last 3 columns of tables not filled. To be clarified.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Only 2 species listed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	No sampling of landings; no concurrent sampling; Achievement is always less than 50%
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	Misinterpretation with the regulation – the old regulation was referenced (1639/2001); Sampling of landings explained but not acceptable; Text to be reviewed and modified by MS – Transversal information not relevant here
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional And international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	Text provided not relevant
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
	REGION Mediterranean		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		

III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	Yes	
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	Not clear for BFT and eel
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Mediterranean		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	No sampling done in 2009
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	Deviations explained but not justified
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	No text provided
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.F	Transversal variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are there deviations from the NP proposal?	NA	Data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are there deviations from the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are there deviations from the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea MEDITS and MEDIAS		
III.G.1	Achievements: and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	

	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Yes	
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	.
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is asked to clarify the inconsistency of the response rate mentioned in the text and the response rate in the table IV.A.3, as in cases where a questionnaire was used the response rate was 63 %, so if different sources were used a range has to be given. It even remains unclear why the response rate in case of the variable "imputed value of unpaid labour" is 100%, as it is based on the questionnaire as source.
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP Proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Partly	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS is recommended to update the population to the real number of fish processors as mentioned in the text.
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	MS is asked to clarify why it does only collect data on fish processors processing marine fishes. The DCF regulation does not have any

			provision allowing this exclusion. MS is recommended to follow the DCF.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	It is unclear, if MS has collected the mandatory data. MS to clarify.
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Mostly	For indicators estimated from survey data, it seems that MS don't sample all the catch during survey. To be clarified by MS
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Not enough detail provided – to be split by expert groups within the RFMO. Information must be provided by Data calls
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Partly	Only economic recommendations provided. MS to update
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	For economic recommendations only
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	Yes	
X.	References		

	Is there a complete list of references?	Partly	
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	NA	
General comments Biological part: NP not fully implemented for Metier variables and not implemented for Stock related variables			

SPAIN

Module	Questions to be checked by evaluators	Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance		
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Yes	
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No	National coordination meeting mentioned only in Table II.B.1 but no text provided
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Yes	
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	Partly	MS to update
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	For recommendations provided
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No	MS did not include a description of the fishing sector. Only one line referring to table III.B.1 as a summary of the fishing sector which is not sufficient.
III.B	Economic variables	Mostly	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Planned and achieved sample sizes does not make sense. In some cases planned sample sizes are extremely low hence the achieved sample sizes are inadequate for statistical analyses. In other cases achieved sample sizes were much higher than planned sample sizes MS should clarify this. MS is asked to provide this table in English.
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS is asked to provide table in English.
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	Impossible to evaluate since table was in Spanish and no English table was presented to SGRN 10-02

III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Information in the AR is not sufficient enough to evaluate the achievements.
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	Yes	
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	Reference year for 2009 collection refers to 2007. MS has described changes in collection in order to produce data faster.
	REGION North Sea & Eastern Arctic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Yes	
	Were CV targets met?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	CV for volume of discards to be provided by MS
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Mostly	
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	

	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Sampling scheme for landings to be revised to cover more species
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Number of samples achieved significantly less than planned for some species in NAFO areas
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Yes	
	Were CV targets met?	Partly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Mostly	Working document in Iberian waters (RCM NA 2008) recommendation missing
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Mediterranean		The large pelagic species for the Mediterranean should be included with the other species; they should not be in separate sections in text
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Total no. of trips in sampling year missing for most metiers
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	No samples for discards presented in table when sampling was done concurrently at sea
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Number of trips are low and number of fish is low in some cases
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	Reference for justifying no discards sampling (RCM recommendation)
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Partly	CVs not provided for all species; CVs not provided for discards in all cases; discrepancy with text: MS to clarify

	Were CV targets met?	No	Only met for 5 species
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Not justifiable
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Mostly	RCM recommendation 2009 on reference for not sampling of discards not listed
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
	REGION CECAF		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	CVs only provided for landings, but not for discards and volume of discards (except for hake)
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Partly	Only provided for landings and for discards for hake only
	Were CV targets met?	Partly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION ICCAT (Atlantic), IOTC, IATCC, WCPFC, etc.		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	

	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Difficult to assess since the number of planned trips was not given
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Mostly	
	Were CV targets met?	No	Only met for 3 species
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Mostly	
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	Partly	For eel only; MS to clarify regarding sea bass
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	No deviations explained for sea bass
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	Mostly	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Partly	
	REGION Mediterranean		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	Partly	No information on eel recreational fishery; Eel to be clarified by MS
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	Yes	For BFT

	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
	REGION North Sea & Eastern Arctic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Yes	In some cases, ranges were given
	Were CV targets met?	Mostly	MS to clarify why ranges were given
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Mostly	No action described for weighing problem
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Mostly	
	Were CV targets met?	Mostly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Mostly	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	

	REGION Mediterranean		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Eel not present; MS to update
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	For LPF, achievements were very good, less for other species
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	For GFCM covered species
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Yes	
	Were CV targets met?	Mostly/Partly	Mostly for GFCM; Partly for LPF
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No/Mostly	No for GFCM and Mostly for LPF
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION CECAF		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	Triennial sampling; MS to clarify re periodicity to calculate CVs
	Were CV targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Mostly	
	REGION ICCAT (Atlantic), IOTC, IATTC, WCPFC, etc		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP	Mostly	

	proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Mostly	
	Were CV targets met?	Mostly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	No explanation for non calculated CVs
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Mostly	
III.F	Transversal variables	Mostly	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Table is empty in the AR. MS is asked to provide this table.
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA because data are collected through census
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	

	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA because data are collected through census
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G	Research surveys at sea – Mediterranean surveys (MEDITS and MEDIAS)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Information for MEDIAS survey missing; total no. of nm wrong
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Correct for MEDITS, not clear for MEDIAS
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes / No	Yes for MEDITS, no deviations mentioned for MEDIAS
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Mostly	Not complete for MEDIAS
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G	Research surveys at sea – Atlantic surveys: IBTS surveys		Mackerel Eggs survey and Sardine DEPM (SAREVA) survey not conducted in 2009 since they are triennial and will take place in 2010 2011 respectively
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	No info and text on Blue whiting survey
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		

	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	Nothing about RCM agreement on Blue whiting survey
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea – PELACUS		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	'Planned target' for acoustic is the number of nm not number of transects
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea – BIOMAN		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	80 – 89% achievement
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	No deviations listed. MS to update
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant	NA	

	RCM(s) listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Partly	MS to clarify
III.G	Research surveys at sea – NAFO area		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Yes	
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	SGRN recommends MS to specify the accuracy indicator used to obtain the sampling error, as sampling error can be calculated by different methods.
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR	Mostly	In table IV.B.1 type of data

	guidelines?		collection scheme for companies with 20 and more employees does not correspond to the given number for the planned sample.
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	MS planned a "Census" for companies with 20 and more employees but it did a sampling survey. Also the table IV.B.1 does not correspond to the AR text in section IV.B.2. MS is asked to clarify.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	SGRN reminds MS that it has to collect data for enterprises having processing not as their main activity.
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Columns missing or not complete
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	Information to be provided by MS
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	SG-MOS and economic data calls missing
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Yes	

	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	Yes	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Partly	MS to update list
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	
General comments SGRN notes that the AR was a good report and mostly complete. It was also made clear when the targets were not achieved. SGRN asks to respect the regional stratification as found in the regulation. Splitting of fishing grounds not necessary and also no need to split Mediterranean large pelagics from the other species.			

SWEDEN

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?	Mostly	No information on whether changes/difficulties were present
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Mostly	Role of partners not clearly presented
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Yes	
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	
III.B	Economic variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS is recommended to present different sampling strategies in separate lines in the future. Sampling of inactive vessels should be >0, as capacity and capital value will be collected.
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS did not provide clustering scheme in the NP. MS is recommended to provide a clustering scheme and justification in the NP, even if it is of preliminary nature, as effort data are only available ex-post
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	The naming of variable groups (e.g. "variable cost") or variables ("in-year investments") is in some cases not in line with the regulation. Variable group "Landings" is not assigned properly. Variables from

			Appendix VIII of the regulation are not required in this table. The accuracy indicator for bias should be named "response rate" in the case of a census.
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	The very detailed and helpful description should be part of the NP in the future.
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	Yes	
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Baltic Sea		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN acknowledges filling of table
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are there deviations from the NP proposal?	Mostly	Number of trips achieved are significantly less than planned for some of the metiers (Tables III.C.3 & III.C.4). Number of fish sampled is in accordance with NP
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Partly	
	Were CV targets met?	Partly	Information only available on the 4 stocks for which CV was calculated
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Deviation explained but not fully justified
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Sea and East Arctic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	Table acknowledged by SGRN
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are there deviations from the NP proposal?	Mostly	Number of trips achieved are significantly less than planned for some of the metiers (Tables III.C.3 & III.C.4) Number of fish sampled is in accordance with NP
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	No	
	Were CV targets met?	No	No CVs provided
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Deviation explained but not fully justified
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Baltic Sea and North Sea & Arctic		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	Yes	
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Partly	Not clear for eel; MS to clarify if the national regulation related to eel applied for whole sampling year
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	Partly	First year of implementation for cod and poor quality for salmon
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	

III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Partly	Action for Recommendation RCM NS & EA 2009 on inland sampling of eel to be amended to include national regulation on ban of eel fishery in Sweden
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION Baltic Sea and North Sea		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Mostly / No	Mostly for ALKs and weight at age; No for sex-ratio and maturity at length and age
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	Refer to Annex
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	SGRN notes the efforts of Sweden to conduct bilateral agreement and task sharing
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.F	Transversal variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	The accuracy indicator for bias should be named "response rate" in the case of a census.
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		

III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea UWTV survey Nephrops		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements in compliance with the NP proposal?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No	Acceptable due to circumstances
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Was the quality of the survey maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	

III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G	Research surveys at sea All other surveys		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Formula missing (% achieved no. of days) for Baltic international acoustic survey
	Is it compliant with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Was the quality of the survey maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	SGRN appreciates the thorough analysis of the aquaculture sector in Sweden. SGRN remarks that clustering is not foreseen in DCF regulation. MS should also be aware that population consists of enterprises having aquaculture as their main activity. MS is asked to clarify and to amend.
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	Mostly	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		

	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Yes	It remains unclear why Sweden did not widen it's sampling already in the past, as data collection for fish processing is mandatory since several years. MS to clarify.
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table IV.B.2 mentions A and B as Data collection schemes. This is not reflected in table IV.B.1. MS to clarify.
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	It is unclear, if MS has collected the mandatory data.
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievement consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	Yes	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Partly	RCM reports, PGCCDBS reports, COST report are missing
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	
General comments The AR was well described. Text and tables are coherent. Deviations are clearly outlined.			

UNITED KINGDOM

Module		Compliance level	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance	Mostly	
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?		
II.	National data collection organisation	Yes	
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	NA	No non-attendencies
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?	No	No list
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No	The table should be provided in the TR.
III.B	Economic variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	NP table indicates 2007 as year of reference Table should include NP reference year (2009-2010) Total no of vessels was 6776 according to Fleet register, only 4887 are represented in the AR. MS is requested to cover the entire fleet.
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Numbers for coverage rate appear to be wrong. Response rates should be provided as well in the future. Column on fleet segments is not filled in properly. Some variables are not provided (e.g. no of fishing enterprises).
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP	Yes	

	proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justified?	NA	
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	AR statement refers to IIIB3, not IIIB2. The coverage rates appear inconsistent with numbers provided under IIIB1, where sample rates vary between 1% and 48%
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Sea and East Arctic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Lines should be summarized by DCF region and not by UK labs.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN appreciates MS efforts, as this table was not required in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Separate entries of CVs for each lab. No CVs for Northern Ireland.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Lines should be summarized by DCF region and not by UK labs.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Most of the metiers exceeds the +/- 10 % acceptable limit stated in the guidelines. Many of those are explained in the text, but the splitting of metiers into national labs prevents a thorough evaluation of the consistency between the AR and the NP.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	See comments above.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Partly	In general Scotland provides CVs, England provide precision levels in most cases.
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Not all were explained.
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	

	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Atlantic		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Lines should be summarized by DCF region and not by UK labs.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	SGRN appreciates MS efforts, as this table was not required in the NP proposal.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Separate entries of CVs for each lab. No CVs for Northern Ireland.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Lines should be summarized by DCF region and not by UK labs.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Most of the metiers exceeds the +/- 10 % acceptable limit stated in the guidelines. Many of those are explained in the text, but the splitting of metiers into national lab prevents a thorough evaluation of the consistency between the AR and the NP.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	See comment above.
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Partly	In general Scotland provides CVs, England provide precision levels in most cases and Northern Ireland does not give any such information.
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Partly	Not all were explained.
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Sea and Eastern Arctic.		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	NA	No data collected.
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	MS explains why no data are collected in 2009 due to

			administrative problems. This is not justifiable. Plan exists for 2010.
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	No relevant recommendations from RCM.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION North Atlantic.		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?	No	No description of how data (salmon) were collected is provided. No information on sea bass and eel in inland waters.
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	No	Same explanation as for the NS. See that comment.
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	No relevant recommendations from RCM.
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	No	The reference to "above mentioned comments" is not specific enough.
	REGION North Sea and Eastern Arctic.		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Part of the entries in the table is lab divided, which is not in line with the guidelines.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	A significant amount of the stocks are under-sampled predominantly from surveys. This is explained by logistic problems and low catches. Low catches is justifiable but

			logistic constrains (staff time) are in general not.
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Partly	As precision levels
	Were CV targets met?	Mostly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	No	No list and no explanation
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	No	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Partly	Actions are suggested but no concrete plans are presented.
	REGION North Atlantic.		Text in AR is mostly a copy of the text from the NS EA region
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		
III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Part of the entries in the table is lab divided, which is not in line with the guidelines.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	A significant amount of the stocks are under-sampled predominantly from surveys. This is explained by logistic problems and low catches. Low catches is justifiable but logistic constrains (staff time) are in general not.
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?	Partly	As precision levels
	Were CV targets met?	Mostly	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Partly	Actions are suggested but no concrete plans are presented.
III.F	Transversal variables	Yes	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Type of data collection should be indicated by a letter (A, B or C); Bias indicators should be provided in the future unless guidelines are changed with respect to quality data for

			data collected under other regulations (e.g. logbooks).
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA because data are collected through census.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G	Research surveys at sea		
	Survey: IBTS IQ (Scotland) and IBTS 3Q (SCO +ENG).		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	

	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations.
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	No shortfalls
	Survey: BTS		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations.
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	No shortfalls
	Survey: DYFS		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g.	Yes	

	a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?		
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations.
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	No shortfalls
	Survey: ASH		For this survey only references are a given to the Danish A.R.
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	See comment above.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	See comment above.
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No	See comment above.
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	NA	The MS is not responsible for indices maintenance.
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	Survey: NHAS		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations.
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	

III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	No shortfalls
	Survey: Nephrops UWTV FU6, FU7 and FU8&9		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	(applies only for FU7)
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?		
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations.
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	No shortfalls
	Survey: Western IBTS 4Q (SCO+ ENG) and Western IBTS 1Q (SCO)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?		
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations.
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	No shortfalls
	Survey: ISBCBTS		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP	Yes	

	proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?		
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations.
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	No shortfalls
	Survey: WCBTS		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?		
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations.
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	No shortfalls
	Survey: International Blue Whiting survey		For this survey only references are a given to the Netherlands A.R.
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	See comment above.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	See comment above.
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No	See comment above.
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical	NA	The MS is not responsible for indices maintenance.

	coverage etc.)?		
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
	Survey: Spawning/pre-spawning herring acoustic surveys in Via and VIIa-g		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?		
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations.
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	No shortfalls
	Survey: Nephrops UWTV survey (FU11-13) and (FU 15)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?		
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	No deviations.
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	No shortfalls
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Yes	.
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS is asked to clarify the reference year.
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	SGRN appreciate the change from the NP to an exhaustive data collection scheme. However, even in an exhaustive collection scheme non-response is possible. MS is asked to clarify if the response rate for all items is really 100 %. MS is asked to clarify the reference year.
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Yes	
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Mostly	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	MS refers in a footnote to table IV.B.1 to actions that took place in 2008. This contradicts the reference year in the table. The reference year is the year the collected data refer to and not the year data have been collected. MS to clarify as this AR refers to activities in 2009. It remains also unclear why the information needed in table IV.B.1 for the actions done in 2009 could not be provided five month after the end of the year. MS to clarify. MS is asked to include a segment of enterprises with more than 250 FTE according to DCF regulation.
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR	Partly	MS refers in a footnote to

	guidelines?		table IV.B.2 to actions that took place in 2008. This contradicts the reference year in the table. The reference year is the year the collected data refer to and not the year data have been collected. MS to clarify as this AR refers to activities in 2009. It remains also unclear why the information needed in table IV.B.2 for the actions done in 2009 could not be provided five month after the end of the year. MS to clarify. MS is asked to include a segment of enterprises with more than 250 FTE according to DCF regulation.
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	MS is asked to clarify if the described achievements refer to 2009 actions.
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?	No	It is unclear, if MS has collected the mandatory data. MS is asked to clarify.
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?	NA	
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	NA	
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	Yes	
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Table not completed although the text covers all achievements required regarding the indicators.
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	AR states that no actions are needed.
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	

	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?	Mostly	Nothing is mentioned about Northern Ireland.
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?	NA	No shortfalls stated.
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?	Yes	
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	Yes	
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?	No	
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	
General comments Considering the complexity of the various fisheries, the report meets the requirements with some minor deficiencies except that the report in many parts is further sub-divided from DCF regions into contributions from different national labs (England and Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland), which is not in line with the guidelines and should be changed in the future.			

SECTION 2

Data transmission and end-users feedback

SGRN carried out a general overview of the availability, quality and gaps of the data collected under the DCF (or, previously, under the DCR). There is a long list of issues emerging from this exercise, which need various follow-ups at different levels, because the problems are broader than those indicated by the Terms of Reference.

SGRN identified some categories of problems:

1. *Major issues that need a particular attention by the Commission and a throughout communication with pertinent bodies and MS concerned (e.g. total landings), where a cross-check can be done at the Commission level*

According to the STECF Spring Plenary 2010 report, it is clear that there are too many discrepancies in the official total landings (=total retained catch) declaration by almost all MS and that this situation is general for all areas to a different extent. This particular issue seems to be very complex, requiring a major effort by the Commission to be solved, but it is essential, because the total landings are one of the most relevant parameters for assessment¹, for economic analysis and for establishing the sampling levels and the related share of the DCF funding. Total landings reported by MS in DCF NP proposals are the basis for establishing sampling plans in the NPs and if these are incorrect, the bias affects not only the NP of the MS concerned, but all the other NPs.

Total landings officially declared by MS within the DCF are generally not matching the total landings reported to EUROSTAT or to various RFMOs and the exercise carried out by SGMED-09-03 and reported again by STECF-10-01 provided a very detailed example. Even if the work done by SGMED-09-03 concerns only the Mediterranean species and MS, both STECF and SGRN believe that similar problems exist in other areas. There might be several reasons for these discrepancies (different statistical services, different rising factors, etc.) but not enough to justify the different official catch figures. Nevertheless, this situation is of major concern as the discrepancies are likely affecting the entire fishery system and the credibility of the DCF. Official total landings data should be always the same, in all databases, as the source for the fishery data should be the same in all MS. Small and minor discrepancies are always possible, because of various data aggregation according to different rules and systems, but important discrepancies should not occur and need to be fixed.

SGRN, on this issue, suggests the following approach:

- an electronic annual cross-check among all the total landings data reported by MS, by area and by species to each RFMOs or International Organisations concerned (limited to those having a public database and where the data submission is mandatory), against the data reported within DCF reports; this exercise can be carried out by the Commission (e.g. by JRC) and the discrepancies should be listed and discussed by the Commission with MS concerned and possibly fixed;

¹ Some organisations such as ICES in some stocks assessments use other total catch figures. In these cases, total landings data provided by MS are not used because scientists provide other figures which are considered more reliable (i.e. adjusted by survey data).

- an EC domestic agreement with EUROSTAT to use the same source (e.g. DCF) for fishery data.

The same approach can be used for fleet and effort data, even if the situation will become maybe less clear with the *métier* approach. In fact, total fleet figures should always be the same in all databases, while fleet segmentations by *métier* will provide detailed information.

2. *General problems concerning the needs of the various RFMOs where EU fleets are active (i.e.: data transmissions, data quality, etc.), where a cross-check exercise needs MoUs with the various RFMOs*

It is necessary to establish a template table to cross-check with various RFMOs and International Organisations if data collected under the DCF have been regularly transmitted to each Organisation and if data have been used. SGRN is concerned about the diversity of requirements in each Organisation and the complexity of this exercise, because of the number of species and parameters required. According to the available information, template tables already exist in ICES and they have been presented to SGRN in recent years. These tables are considered useful to provide a part of the information required. In some cases, data officially transmitted by MS were not used because of poor quality and this is not a mandatory option on the ICES template or in Table VI.1 of the DCF Annual Reports, because the formal obligation is fulfilled independently from the quality. SGRN considers essential to maintain these ICES forms and to request data users to fill them in. At the moment, the form is filled by each ICES Stock coordinator, and the ICES Secretariat has the role to assemble all the information in a database and provide it to the Commission. In addition to the table, quality information is sometimes provided in the WG reports.

The ICES form served as a well-working example and provides also the indication that additional quality information is needed to better assess the data transmitted to the final users. The ICES example also provides the need to have formal agreements (MoUs) with all the final users, to fill a template and provide the necessary feedback on the data issues to the Commission.

SGRN considers the template for biological variables actually used for the feedback from ICES as a valid option and suggests adapting it for several final users (ICCAT, ICES, GFCM, STECF-SGMED). The template (see Annex 5) concerns only data from EU Member States. The template is provided also for other final users (CECAF, NAFO, IOTC, IATTC, WCPFC, CCAMLR, SPRFMO). The templates for economic and/or other variables including transversal variables are presented in Annexes 6-8. These templates should be proposed, discussed and agreed with the Organisations concerned; eventually lines should be inserted on the bottom part of the templates, with the purpose to carry out an electronic check. The templates should be delivered by each Organisation (final user) to the EC until 30 June of each year. This will allow SGRN to have the necessary feedback when revising the TR.

3. *Specific problems where it should be necessary to improve the existing framework*

Several issues regarding this point have been raised during the SGRN and it is clear that many problems still exist. Not all of them can be solved in a short time. Concerning the naming conventions and the code specifications, SGRN recommends both MS and end users to strictly following the DCF guidelines and the codifications of the DCF Decisions 2008/949/EC and 2010/93/EU. Moreover, the agreement reached at Regional Level should be

taken into consideration. Here a first list is provided, with the purpose to point out some issues where adjustments of the current DCF should be carried out:

- Use of common codes: sometimes codes used in the DCF are not the same of codes already used since many years in various RFMOs. This fact creates problems to the system, because it implies additional workload for MS in transmitting the data to the pertinent international Organisations. There are several possible solutions. For concerned species, metier and gear codes, it should be sufficient to couple the codes used in the DCF with those used in the Organisation(s) concerned in the DCF tables by adding another column.
- The use of common area codes is not straightforward, as each RFMO or Organisation is following different divisions. The possible solution might be to include in the DCF only the codes used by the pertinent Organisation for the stocks concerned replacing the codes present in the DCF Commission Decision. This will improve the use of the DCF data but it is not always possible or simple when different RFMOs are using different area units (i.e. ICCAT and GFCM in the Mediterranean Sea).
- It is important to have well-defined fleet and effort data, particularly for those where specific licences are required (i.e. the last ICCAT Rec. 09-04 establishes a detailed list of vessels for those fishing for swordfish and other large pelagic species, with a specific licence by target species; this provision fits very well the DCF segmentation, but also needs to clarify the number of vessels having more than one licence (clustering exercise), with the purpose to provide a more precise image of the fleet).
- Adapt the number of biological samples (age, maturity, etc.) or the number of trips for discards to the real need of the stock assessment. It is quite clear that the current levels are sometimes not adequate for the real needs of several WGs or RFMOs. If funding is a limit, it should be considered to concentrate only in those stocks and/or *metiér* where data are needed for assessment purposes in a given year; this can be done also within the existing framework (see other points below).

4. *Specific problems where quality checks are possible within the existing framework.*

Several actions are already possible within the existing framework. The previous point is one of them, but various quality checks might be further improved at the NP and AR revision level, at the JRC level during the call for data and at the various STECF-WGs level where data are used.

ICES PGCCDBS and the PGMED are the fora for planning and co-ordination of data collection for stock assessment purposes in the ICES and in Mediterranean & Black Sea area, respectively. These two planning groups coordinate and initiate the development of methods and adopt sampling standards and guidelines. The role of PGCCDBS and PGMED is fundamental for the quality and consistency of data collection.

The Regional Coordination Meetings (RCMs) coordinate the national sampling plans between the Member States of each region. Feedback on data issues should be addressed by RCMs. RCMs should notify Member States on improvements or data requests by the Planning Groups and end-users.

The Liaison Meeting (LM) harmonizes the RCMs work, and also involves the participation of PGCCDBS, PGMED and representatives of the several DCF data end-users. It is fundamental that the Liaison meeting addresses the data improvements or data requests by the Planning Groups and end-users sent to the RCMs.

PGCCDBS has implemented since 2009 a feedback from ICES assessment working groups on data issues. This information is sent to PGCCDBS and RCMs. An example of this feedback was presented by the Working Group of Hake Monk and Megrim 2010 to the RCM-NA 2010 (see Annex 9). A comprehensive feedback from each ICES Expert Group will be time consuming and at the moment the workload in ICES Expert Groups meetings is quite heavy.

SGRN recommends that a compilation from the advice section be prepared by PGCCDBS in cooperation with ICES Secretariat. All RCMs and PGMED should verify the consistency of the data provided and eventually STECF-SGRN should further check the data used.

ICES gives information on data submitted and used in ICES assessment expert groups. For each stock, a “data table” is provided. The information in each table concerns: (i) catches – landings and discards; (ii) length composition – landings and discards; (iii) age-length key; (iv) age composition – landings and discards; (v) maturity data; (vi) sex ratio; (vii) fisheries dependent and independent tuning fleets. The data tables for all stocks are compiled in a database. The database sent in 2010 included the information from assessment workings groups that took place before June 25th in 2010 – the deadline for ICES to submit this information. For workings groups that meet after this deadline, the 2008 data submitted to 2009 working group meetings have been presented.

SGRN is aware of the workload of ICES EGs meetings. The comments incorporated in data tables are useful for SGRN, but time is necessary to dedicate to data collection issues in EGs meetings. Table 2.1 presents some examples of data transmission problems. Detailed information on the various parameters and MS is available in the “data tables” database. One major data problem that affects this year assessment (2009 data) is the landings information from France. For some stocks, the data was not provided to the stocks coordinators. In other cases, the stocks coordinator decided not to use the data due to bad quality. This problem didn’t affect all stocks for which France is involved, because in some cases it was possible to provide alternative landings estimates.

ICES has a data documentary database for assessment input data – InterCatch. Not all stocks are using InterCatch at the moment. Stock coordinators have difficulties to upload all national data related to their coordinated stocks, mainly due to workload. ICES strongly recommended that each Member State submits data under InterCatch in order to facilitate the feedback on provided and used as basis for advice, and to improve the record and data verification. Members States should submit data in the end-users format, being InterCatch in case of ICES. The fully used of InterCatch will also facilitate the “quantity” checking of the data submitted.

In the ICES advisory documents (<http://www.ices.dk/advice/icesadvice.asp>), there is one section on Quality Consideration. This section is dedicated to data and methodologies issues related with the basis for advice. As an illustration the text available for Plaice in the North Sea is presented:

“The assessment is considered to be uncertain, partly because discards form a substantial part of the total catch and cannot be well estimated from the low number of annual sampling trips, but most importantly due to the large differences in abundance observed in the different regions of the North Sea.”

Table 2.1: Examples of some data transmission problems

Assessment Year	Working Group	Stock	Country	Comment
2010	WGHMM	Megrim (<i>L. whiffiagonis</i>) in Subarea VII and Divisions VIIa,b,d	Belgium	In 2008, no assessment was carried out due to lack of data quality. In 2009, improvement of data was obtained however still more improvement is required if an analytical assessment is to be tried. Thus, in 2009 no analytical assessment was either developed
2010	WGHMM	Megrim (<i>L. whiffiagonis</i>) in Subarea VII and Divisions VIIa,b,d	France	In 2008, no assessment was carried out due to lack of data quality. In 2009, improvement of data was obtained however still more improvement is required if an analytical assessment is to be tried. Thus, in 2009 no analytical assessment was either developed
2010	WGHMM	Megrim (<i>L. whiffiagonis</i>) in Subarea VII and Divisions VIIa,b,d	Ireland	In 2008, no assessment was carried out due to lack of data quality. In 2009, improvement of data was obtained however still more improvement is required if an analytical assessment is to be tried. Thus, in 2009 no analytical assessment was either developed
2010	WGHMM	Megrim (<i>L. whiffiagonis</i>) in Subarea VII and Divisions VIIa,b,d	Spain	In 2008, no assessment was carried out due to lack of data quality. In 2009, improvement of data was obtained however still more improvement is required if an analytical assessment is to be tried. Thus, in 2009 no analytical assessment was either developed
2010	WGHMM	Megrim (<i>L. whiffiagonis</i>) in Subarea VII and Divisions VIIa,b,d	United Kingdom	In 2008, no assessment was carried out due to lack of data quality. In 2009, improvement of data was obtained however still more improvement is required if an analytical assessment is to be tried. Thus, in 2009 no analytical assessment was either developed
2010	WGHMM	Black anglerfish (<i>L. budegassa</i>) Division VIIIc and IXa	Portugal	Surveys at sea: Due to the very low catchability of trawl surveys for anglerfish; Discard data: Due to gaps in time series; Age -Length-Key, Age Composition, Weight at age: Scientific problems in age determination; Maturity information: Not necessary
2010	WGHMM	Black anglerfish (<i>L. budegassa</i>) Division VIIIc and IXa	Spain	Surveys at sea: Due to the very low catchability of trawl surveys for anglerfish; Discard data: Due to gaps in time series; Age -Length-Key, Age Composition, Weight at age: Scientific problems in age determination; Maturity information: Not necessary
2010	WGHMM	White anglerfish (<i>L. piscatorius</i>) in Divisions VIIIc and IXa	Portugal	Surveys at sea: Due to the very low catchability of trawl surveys for anglerfish; Discard data: Due to gaps in time series; Age -Length-Key, Age Composition, Weight at age: Scientific problems in age determination; Maturity information: Not necessary
2010	WGHMM	White anglerfish (<i>L. piscatorius</i>) in Divisions VIIIc and IXa	Spain	Surveys at sea: Due to the very low catchability of trawl surveys for anglerfish; Discard data: Due to gaps in time series; Age -Length-Key, Age Composition, Weight at age: Scientific problems in age determination; Maturity information: Not necessary
2010	WGHMM	Northern Hake	Belgium	This year, no assessment conducted with 2009 data because of very poor quality of the French data in 2009.
2010	WGHMM	Northern Hake	Denmark	This year, no assessment conducted with 2009 data because of very poor quality of the French data in 2009.
2010	WGHMM	Northern Hake	France	This year, no assessment conducted with 2009 data because of very poor quality of the French data in 2009.
2010	WGHMM	Northern Hake	Ireland	This year, no assessment conducted with 2009 data because of very poor quality of the French data in 2009.
2010	WGHMM	Northern Hake	Netherlands	This year, no assessment conducted with 2009 data because of very poor quality of the French data in 2009.
2010	WGHMM	Northern Hake	Spain	This year, no assessment conducted with 2009 data because of very poor quality of the French data in 2009.
2010	WGHMM	Northern Hake	Sweden	This year, no assessment conducted with 2009 data because of very poor quality of the French data in 2009.
2010	WGHMM	Northern Hake	Engl. & Wales	This year, no assessment conducted with 2009 data because of very poor quality of the French data in 2009.
2010	WGHMM	Northern Hake	Scotland	This year, no assessment conducted with 2009 data because of very poor quality of the French data in 2009.

2010	WGDEEP	Greater forkbeard (Phycis blennoides) in the Northeast Atlantic	France	Length composition of landings provided by Spain, France, Scotland, and Ireland come from Surveys (Porcupine, IBTS, Cantabrian Sea) not from commercial vessels
2010	WGDEEP	Greater forkbeard (Phycis blennoides) in the Northeast Atlantic	Ireland	Length composition of landings provided by Spain, France, Scotland, and Ireland come from Surveys (Porcupine, IBTS, Cantabrian Sea) not from commercial vessels
2010	WGDEEP	Greater forkbeard (Phycis blennoides) in the Northeast Atlantic	Portugal	Length composition of landings provided by Spain, France, Scotland, and Ireland come from Surveys (Porcupine, IBTS, Cantabrian Sea) not from commercial vessels
2010	WGDEEP	Greater forkbeard (Phycis blennoides) in the Northeast Atlantic	Spain	Length composition of landings provided by Spain, France, Scotland, and Ireland come from Surveys (Porcupine, IBTS, Cantabrian Sea) not from commercial vessels
2010	WGDEEP	Greater forkbeard (Phycis blennoides) in the Northeast Atlantic	Basque Country (Spain)	Length composition of landings provided by Spain, France, Scotland, and Ireland come from Surveys (Porcupine, IBTS, Cantabrian Sea) not from commercial vessels
2010	WGDEEP	Greater forkbeard (Phycis blennoides) in the Northeast Atlantic	Engl. & Wales	Length composition of landings provided by Spain, France, Scotland, and Ireland come from Surveys (Porcupine, IBTS, Cantabrian Sea) not from commercial vessels
2010	WGDEEP	Greater forkbeard (Phycis blennoides) in the Northeast Atlantic	Scotland	Length composition of landings provided by Spain, France, Scotland, and Ireland come from Surveys (Porcupine, IBTS, Cantabrian Sea) not from commercial vessels
2010	WGBFAS	Cod in Kattegat	Sweden	Discard estimates of one country are difficult to use in assessment when the estimates of total discards are uncertain
2010	WGBFAS	Herring (in Subdivision 31)	Finland	Explanation to all but tunings: No (official) assessment made in 2010 due to ACOM decision in 2007. NOR in Swedish commercial tuning fleet might as well be NR. NOR in Surveys at sea: No survey was performed.
2010	WGBFAS	Herring (in Subdivision 31)	Sweden	Explanation to all but tunings: No (official) assessment made in 2009 due to ACOM decision in 2007. NOR in Swedish commercial tuning fleet might as well be NR. NOR in Surveys at sea: No survey was performed.
2010	HAWG	Herring in Division VIIa (North)	Netherlands	The Dutch supplied samples of the English fleet catch. These were raised to English catch
2010	WGCSE	Anglerfish in Subareas IV and VI	Belgium	No catch based or length based assessment possible due to uncertainties in tuning data and incomplete international datasets
2010	WGCSE	Anglerfish in Subareas IV and VI	Denmark	No catch based or length based assessment possible due to uncertainties in tuning data and incomplete international datasets
2010	WGCSE	Anglerfish in Subareas IV and VI	Ireland	No catch based or length based assessment possible due to uncertainties in tuning data and incomplete international datasets
2010	WGCSE	Anglerfish in Subareas IV and VI	Engl. & Wales	No catch based or length based assessment possible due to uncertainties in tuning data and incomplete international datasets
2010	WGCSE	Anglerfish in Subareas IV and VI	North. Ireland	No catch based or length based assessment possible due to uncertainties in tuning data and incomplete international datasets
2010	WGCSE	Cod in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)	Ireland	Commercial tuning fleets: data provided but currently not used in the assessment which uses surveys for tuning.
2010	WGCSE	Cod in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)	United Kingdom	Commercial tuning fleets: data provided but currently not used in the assessment which uses surveys for tuning.
2010	WGCSE	Cod in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)	Engl. & Wales	Commercial tuning fleets: data provided but currently not used in the assessment which uses surveys for tuning.
2010	WGCSE	Cod in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)	North. Ireland	Commercial tuning fleets: data provided but currently not used in the assessment which uses surveys for tuning.
2010	WGNSSK	Plaice in Division VIId	Belgium	Belgian discards data not provided
2010	WGNSSK	Plaice in Division VIId	France	French discards data not raised to the population; French commercial tuning fleet was not requested following the benchmark conclusion
2010	WGNSSK	Plaice in Division VIId	Engl. & Wales	UK discards not used as long as French and belgian don't bring age structure of discards raised to the population; English commercial tuning fleet was not requested following the benchmark conclusion

2009	WGWIDE	Herring in the Northeast Atlantic (Norwegian spring-spawning herring)	Germany	Discard data were not used in the assessment because they were not provided: not reported
2009	WGWIDE	Herring in the Northeast Atlantic (Norwegian spring-spawning herring)	Ireland	Discard data were not used in the assessment because they were not provided: not reported
2009	WGWIDE	Herring in the Northeast Atlantic (Norwegian spring-spawning herring)	Netherlands	Discard data were not used in the assessment because they were not provided: not reported
2009	WGWIDE	Herring in the Northeast Atlantic (Norwegian spring-spawning herring)	Scotland	Discard data were not used in the assessment because they were not provided: not reported
2009	WGCSE	Nephrops in Divisions VII gh (FU20-22 ; Celtic Sea)	France	For DISCARDS: modification of the hand-sorting process involving in tailing individuals (increasing significantly during recent years): that may affect discard rate (decreasing during the same period). For TUNING FLEET: no French data for 2009

Response of MS regarding Data Calls

1. Mediterranean (SGMED/RCM Med&BS)

The Group revised the comments made both by JRC (Data Coverage and Quality Report 2010) and the comments in the draft Liaison Meeting Report 2010 (3rd and 4th June 2010) with the observations made during last RCM Med&BS. During 2010, DG MARE launched an official call for data on landings, catches, length and age compositions, fishing effort, trawl and hydroacoustic surveys and economic data in the Mediterranean Sea to support the relevant STECF-SGMED meeting.

Concerning the biological data, only two countries managed to upload through the JRC server most of the data requested by the deadline. Following unsuccessful attempts, some MS submitted the files by email to JRC before the meeting. As stated by the JRC report, those data were not quality-checked during the upload procedure, as all the other files submitted by other Member States. However, the data were made available to the experts attending the SGMED meeting. To some extent, the work of the STECF-SGMED working group was impeded due to the lack of several official data for 2009 in order to perform the assessments in specific GSAs.

The economic data requested will be processed in the second SGMED assessment meeting in December 2010, and the data provided have been checked for the time being only in terms of coverage.

SGRN welcomes the preparatory work made by JRC using an automatic quality checking tool to verify the quality and validate the data, evaluating the data provided by Member States and identify missing values. The system also created special data structures (e.g. tables) to allow monitoring of incoming data and its compliance with the requirements of the data call. The JRC report presented a detailed description of the uploading activity, and it is quite clear from this description that some MS had several problems in uploading the data (i.e. MEDITS survey data) or to make all the data sets available (i.e. 2009 data). Other problems are related to naming convention (i.e.: *métier* level 5, *métier* level 6), missing data for some parameters (i.e. effort, landing) or stock-related variables (i.e. growth parameters, sex ratio etc.) in some areas. Concerning the quality of the data submitted to SGMED through the JRC data call, SGRN was not in the position to evaluate it because the SGMED report was not available yet. However, a detailed list of data issues for each GSA and stock has been conducted by SGMED and will be available in the SGMED-10-02 report in September.

Concerning naming conventions and code specifications, the SGRN recommends both MS and end users to strictly follow the DCF guidelines and the codifications of the DCF Decisions 2008/949/EC and 2010/93/EU. Moreover, the agreement reached at Regional Level (in this particular case the agreement achieved during the RCM Med&BS) should be taken into consideration.

On the other side, SGRN reviewed some issues coming from the draft Liaison Meeting Report 2010 with comments made during last RCM Med&BS. Participants to the RCM Med&BS recommend the following improvements in the context of data calls:

- respect legal provisions to deliver data calls (minimum 1 month before the date);
- provide clearer indications on variables required;

- standardize the formats to deliver the data, possibly in agreement with common formats used at Regional Level; respect DCF formats and do not change formats from one year to another;
- develop an uploading system which put in evidence eventual errors, clearly listing them.

RCM Med&BS participants were also concerned about the extremely restrictive filter of the data calls that make uploading of the data very difficult.

SGRN considers all the above-mentioned issues as very important to facilitate the work and recommends improving the link between MS and the JRC in order to make the JRC tool working efficiently. In order to improve the uploading procedures, SGRN recommends MS to report problems with the upload of data in detail to JRC and DG MARE.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends MS to report technical problems with the upload of data in detail to JRC and DG MARE. The consistency of data with the DCF and Data Call lies in the responsibility of the Member States.	<p>Member States to report technical uploading problems to JRC and DG MARE.</p> <p>Member States to ensure consistency of the data with the DCF and Data Calls.</p>

Furthermore, SGRN agrees with the consideration made by RCM Med&BS to respect the legal provisions to deliver data calls. SGRN recalled also the suggestion reported by the SGMED-09-03 (December 2009): *“some national data deliveries hardly met minimum standards requested in the data call regarding deadlines, inconsistent codification and units of data. This caused extra work and intersessional cooperation on all levels from data receipt, quality checking, data access and evaluation. SGMED recommends appropriate time be allowed for such processing of data. In addition and in accordance with the provisions of the DCF to allow appropriate data preparation by Member States, SGMED recommends future data calls are issued at least 2 months in advance of assessment meetings.”*

2. Fishing effort (SGMOS 10-04)

DG MARE launched a call for data regarding specific catch and effort data on 27th of April 2010. The data were to be reviewed by experts during the SGMOS 10-04 meeting (Lisbon, 14-18 June 2010). This was the first year the “fishing effort data call” was managed through the official DCF framework although this was the sixth year of data collection. Data upload was carried out on the STECF DCF website or through e-mail. No automatic checks are currently built-in in the data uploading system and all checks by the JRC are carried out manually. Inconsistencies were communicated back to the MS and necessary manipulations are agreed or re-submissions are requested.

Submitted data consisted of three tables:

- Table A Catch, including landings and discards as well as further biological variables
- Table B Nominal Fishing Effort
- Table C Effective Fishing Effort, fished hours by ICES statistical rectangle

By 23 June 2010, for 10 MS, the data provided in Table A, and for 11 MS, data in Tables B and C were considered sufficiently complete for uploading to the joint international databases, on which evaluation will be based.

Many MS did use the new electronic upload procedure during this call which is considered as a major improvement when in the future automatic data quality checks will be implemented in the system. Some MS have submitted poorly quality-checked data and, as of the 23rd of June, have not re-submitted data considered sufficiently complete to allow STECF SGMOS 10-04 to effectively complete its tasks. Poorly quality-checked data create an additional workload since data needs to be checked, errors communicated and data re-submitted. Poor data quality and erroneous datasets if used as basis for scientific advice and management imply a high risk. A recommendation by the JRC is to formally decide if erroneous data sets should be rejected with the status as not being delivered. It is also pointed out that the review continues to suffer from non-participation of experts from certain MS. Due to issues mentioned above, experts were not able to finish their terms of reference during the Lisbon meeting. As a result, work has to be finished intersessionally and at the second STECF SGMOS meeting 27 September-1 October 2010.

SGRN 10-02 recognizes the problems associated with poorly quality-checked data and erroneous datasets and the risk associated with using them as a basis for scientific advice and management.

SGRN 10-02 recognizes that the failure from MS to provide correct data in the given time frame (i.e. before the meeting) compromises the efficiency of the working group. Due to missing data, the working group was not able to address all ToR completely during the meeting.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends that erroneous datasets should be rejected with the status 'not delivered'.	European Commission to consult with JRC and MS on rejecting erroneous datasets.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends that all MS to thoroughly check the data quality before submitting them and to use the electronic upload procedure and eventual built-in automatic quality checks.	Member States to respect these recommendations.
SGRN strongly recommends that all MS to submit data in the given time frame.	

3. Annual Economic Report (AER) 2010 (SGECA 10-02)

Data delivery time frames

Most MS attempted to upload data in compliance with the data upload deadline. However most of the data upload took place after the deadline but before the SGECA 10-02 meeting, during the meeting and after, due the need of quality improvements once the data sets were inspected by JRC and national experts. This had a negative effect on the possibility to produce the AER in a timely fashion. JRC recommends that more time is made available between the data upload deadline and the AER meeting in the next year for this purpose.

SGRN 10-02 recognizes the problems with the failure to comply with the data upload deadline and this affects the possibility to finish the AER during the meeting. SGRN 10-02 further recognizes that the failure to comply with the deadline may have a serious effect on the working efficiency of the AER meeting.

SGRN 10-02 recognizes the fact that some mistakes and quality issues are not revealed in the data until it is uploaded and checked by the JRC. SGRN 10-02 further recognizes that these issues can be minimised with thorough quality checks by the MS and clear guidelines from the JRC on the requested variables and how to compile the datasets.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends that all MS to thoroughly check the data quality before submitting them and to use the electronic upload procedure and eventual built-in automatic quality checks. SGRN strongly recommends that all MS to submit data in the given time frame.	Member States to respect these recommendations.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends MS to report problems with the upload of data in detail to JRC and DG MARE.	Member States to report uploading problems to JRC and DG MARE.

Target populations

The population for the collection of variables specified under Appendix VI in the Commission Decision 2008/949/EC paragraph III A.1 refers to vessels registered in the fleet register by the 1st of January during the relevant reference year. Vessels entering the fleet after this date are not regarded as a part of the target population regarding the collection of economic variables. The same paragraph says; “*For each vessel for which economic variables defined in Appendix VI are collected, the corresponding transversal variables defined in Appendix VIII have also to be collected.*” This may or may not be interpreted as the obligation to only collect transversal variables for vessels in the fleet register by the 1st of January during the reference year. The number of vessels in the register by the 1st of January may differ from the number of vessels active during the reference year. Clearly this has a disadvantage since it makes little sense to leave out vessels which are active during the year and are active in fisheries, landing

catches. Data collected and reported only for a subset are not sufficient for the use of biologists since it leaves out catches and effort by vessels which enter the fleet after this date. Fishing effort and landings must be measured for the whole year and not for a subset of vessels based on a date in order to be useful to biologists. Data collected in different ways from different MS also compromise the results of the analysis made on the economy of the fleet since it not reflects the reality.

The 1st of January is important only as a date for measuring the total capacity of a MS fleet.

SGRN 10-02 recognize the possibility that some MS only report data, including transversal variables, for vessels in the fleet register by the 1st of January and other MS includes all vessels active in fisheries during the year. SGRN 10-02 also recognize that this may seriously compromise the representativeness and comparability between MS of the data collected and the analyses made from the data.

SGRN 10-02 points out that the transversal variables are the link between economist and biologists. SGRN 10-02 recognize that the differences in definitions of variables and the target populations compromises the possibility of this linkage and data collected by economist may not be usable by biologists.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends all MS should collect economic and transversal data regarding the fishing fleet for all fishing vessels in the vessel register during the reference year, instead of only collecting data on vessels in the fleet register on the 1 st of January in the relevant reference year.	European Commission to amend Commission Decision 2010/93/EU in a way that all vessels which have been part of the fleet register at any time of the year are to be evaluated with respect to all transversal and relevant economic variables.

General data coverage

In terms of completeness most MS submitted the vast majority of parameters requested under the call. Most cases of missing data were related to fleet segments with low vessels numbers and were therefore hard to obtain the samples required to produce meaningful estimates. 3 MS failed to submit significant amounts of data relating to 2008 which made it impossible to evaluate the overall economic performance of the EU fishing fleet in 2008. There are as well some question marks regarding some MS as to whether they submitted data on entirety of their fleet.

SGRN 10-02 recognizes that there are issues with sampling and estimation of segments with a small number of vessels.

SGRN 10-02 recognize that the reluctance from MS to provide any data or significant amount of data seriously compromise the possibility to perform evaluations on the overall economic performance of the EU fishing fleet.

SGRN 10-02 reminds MS that the Commission Decision provides the option to cluster segments both for sampling and estimation purposes in cases where the segments are too small in order to produce estimates individually.

SGRN 10-02 recommends that actions are taken by the Commission against MS which fail to provide data.

Data quality

In terms of data quality the JRC and experts found a significant number of “abnormal” estimates for various parameters that were submitted. Corrections of “abnormalities” were done when possible but some issues are still outstanding and JRC will continue to work on reducing those errors.

SGRN 10-02 recognizes that sampling and estimation of variables may lead to unreliable estimates. However in some cases “abnormal” estimates may stem from misunderstanding of methods and human errors in estimation.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends that workshops are carried out and clear guidelines are provided to MS on variables that are generally found among MS to display unreliable and unlikely estimates. SGRN recommends that an assessment is being carried out on the most problematic variables and to suggest themes for workshops.	European Commission to organise the workshops.

Transversal variables

Capacity

Number of vessels

By cross checking the number of vessels in the EU fleet register as by the 1st of January 2008 and the number of vessels submitted under DCF call for 2008 discrepancies is displayed. Only one of the 22 MS (20 which provided this data under the data call) provided the exact number of vessels as in the EU fleet register by the 1/1 2008. Coverage rates range from 0 % to 123.3 % where 2 MS failed to provide data, 2 MS covered 20-25 %, 2 MS covered 50-60 %, 3 MS covered 90-95 %, 7 MS covered 95-100 %, 5 MS covered 100-105 %, 1 MS covered >120 % of the fleet. Some discrepancy must be allowed due to the nature of living databases where updates and changes constantly happens and the number of vessels may differ depending on the time of extraction of data from the database.

Reasons for discrepancies between the data upload and the EU fleet register may stem from a number of reasons such as:

- The use of an economic activity threshold in sampling scheme where only vessels that carry out fishing as a main commercial activity is included in the economic sampling.
- The use of different target populations such as only vessels in the fleet register by the 1st of January or all vessels active in fisheries during the reference year.
- Some MS did not provide data on inactive vessels.

GT, kW, LOA and Average Age

Discrepancies with the fleet register may stem from the discrepancies regarding the number of vessels. Vessels may also be remeasured during the year and GT, kW and LOA may depend on the time of data extraction from the database, this should not have any effect on average age though since this should be fixed over time. Discrepancies between the EU fleet register and the uploaded data regarding GT, kW, LOA and average age is highly and effect from the discrepancy in the number of vessels in uploaded data. If the target population of vessels do not match the number of vessels in the EU fleet register on the 1st of January it is highly unlikely that the GT, kW, LOA and average age will match the fleet register. The comparison in appendix 3 in *DCF Economic Data Call 2010 Coverage and Quality Report* shows that the deviations for most MS are within plausible limits. The number of vessels reported in the data upload may be slightly larger than the number in the EU fleet register and the GT and kW may be slightly larger or slightly smaller in the upload compares to the register. Deviations are in most cases only a couple of percentage units. For some MS the deviations are extremely large (>10%). Deviations may also be non consistent as for example capacity variables where the number of vessels covered may small but the GT and kW covered may be closer to 100 %.

SGRN 10-02 recognizes that the discrepancies regarding capacity variables are an issue. Depending on the base of target populations discrepancies arise if the target population is not all the vessels in the national fleet register by the 1st of January when comparing the data provided with the EU fleet register of the 1st of January.

SGRN 10-02 stresses the fact that MS shall report data on all vessels including inactive vessels and the usage of economic threshold is not allowed.

Recommendation	Follow-up
SGRN recommends that all MS to thoroughly check the data quality before submitting them and to use the electronic upload procedure and eventual built-in automatic quality checks.	Member States to respect these recommendations.

Effort

No specific issues have been raised regarding effort variables submitted under the data call related to AER 2010. However SGRN 10-02 recognize that general problems existing with other transversal variables are highly likely to exist in the collection and provision of effort variables.

Landings

Regarding landings volume coverage rates of landings volumes with the DCF compared to Eurostat statistics ranged from 0 % to 99.9%. The per 2 MS failed to provide data, 3 MS had no official Eurostat landings at the time, 1 MS covered 10-15%, 3 MS covered 50-60 %, 1 MS covered 65-70 %, 2 MS covered 75-80 %, 4 MS covered 90-95 % and 6 MS covered 95-100 % of the Eurostat data.

One source of discrepancy between the landings volumes submitted under DCF call for data 2008 (table 5.2) and the Eurostat landings volumes 2008 may be that all vessels may not be included in the uploaded data. Since some MS may have used vessels in the fleet register by the 1st of January as the target population for transversal variables as well as the economic variables. Since the target population regarding the collection of economic variables for the fleet consists of only vessels active by the 1st of January during the reference year it does not include vessels that enter the fleet after this date, where the Eurostat data on the other hand consists of all catches during the relevant reference year. This source of discrepancy between the DCF data and the Eurostat data should only account for a couple of percentage units if the target population is the same as the in the EU fleet register by the 1st of January of the relevant reference year, unless any dramatic changes in capacity has happened during the year..

Another source of discrepancy is the problem with confidentiality. For instance in some MS certain segments are two small or all vessels in the segment are owned by the same legal entity. This makes it impossible to report any data on these segment due to confidentiality legislation both domestic and European. The DCF specifies clustering in these cases but clustering may be impossible or at least unfeasible in some cases. In the case of long distance fisheries operating in other supra regions than the main supra region for the rest of the fleet clustering may be impossible due to the different supra regions and data on these vessels are not uploaded during the call for data. Another case is that clustering may be unfeasible in certain cases when there is no possible segment to cluster with. Clustering should be based on statistical analysis and may be between segments with similar characteristics or between non-important segments. For some MS there are no clustering alternatives which will make any sense and if carried out will affect the values on the variables to an extent where analysis possibilities are compromised.

A third source of discrepancy is the possibility that different people derive different numbers for different purposes based on the same or different data sources depending on final use. For instance it may not be same people reporting official catch statistics to Eurostat who estimate the catch statistics in the data collection, even if they are using the same primary data. This is however a problem for which a solution can be found.

SGRN 10-02 recognize the fact that the discrepancies between landings data from Eurostat and landings data provided from the MS during the call for data related to the AER 2010 is an issue.

4. Fish processing industry (SGECA 09-03)

The main data issue regarding the submitting of economic data related to the fish processing sector in 2009 was the low coverage rates. Only 1 MS managed to provide all data requested in the data call. 2 MS failed to provide any data at all and the coverage rates for the rest of the MS varied between 29 % and 94 %. Although the generally low coverage rate is a problem this was the first attempt to compile national statistics and give an overview on the performance of the performance of the fish processing industry in the European Union.

The general low coverage rates compromised analyses possibilities but some conclusions were possible to draw. The main conclusions were that the level of turnover is approximately 25 billion Euros and a Gross Value Added of approximately 4 billion Euros. Furthermore the sector employs around 120 thousand persons. It is necessary to point out the fact that these number are based on the data provided by the MS and may be slightly larger.

SGRN 10-02 recognizes that the failure to provide data for some MS and the generally low coverage rates compromised the analyses possibilities for the SGECA 09-03 working group that met in Ispra 19-23 of October, 2009 in order to analyse the submitted data.

SGRN 10-02 recognize that this was a first attempt to compile national statistics on this level and give an overview of the fish processing sector and some MS have misunderstood the call for data. Hopefully issues with compliance will be sorted out in the future when the economics of fish processing is further implemented in the DCF system.

SGRN 10-02 also recognize that the regulation and the legal framework have changed from data collected for 2007 and data that will be collected for 2008. The changes in the specification of which variables that are required to be collected are significant and it is hard to say how this will affect the compliance of the MS and their provision of data in the future.

Recommendation	Follow-up
<p>SGRN recommends that MS should consult with the national statistical offices in order to improve efficiency and guarantee consistency in the data collection process. Efficiency can be improved because national statistical offices could already have information required to be collected under the DCF. Data consistency will be met if the same definitions are applied.</p> <p>SGRN recommends that MS to follow the specification stated in the DCF and fully comply with future data calls on economic data related to the fish processing sector.</p>	<p>Member States to respect these recommendations.</p>

SECTION 3

Review of surveys: status

SGRN 10-02 notes that the roadmap and deadlines laid down by SGRN 09-04 have been largely followed. The Regional Co-ordination Meetings (RCMs) have reviewed the survey lists in May 2010. DG MARE has compiled one file with all surveys and sent the file to MS on 28 June 2010. MS comments were requested until 2 July 2010, and after STECF endorsement (STECF Plenary, 12-16 July 2010), the list will be forwarded to the Chair of survey review meeting (SGRN 10-03; Brussels, 4-8 Oct 2010).

SECTION 4

References

Legal documents

Council Regulation (EC) No **199/2008** of 25 February 2008 concerning the establishment of a Community framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the Common Fisheries Policy

Commission Regulation (EC) No **665/2008** of 14 July 2008 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008 concerning the establishment of a Community framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the Common Fisheries Policy

Commission Decision No **2008/949/EC** of 6 November 2008 adopting a multiannual Community programme pursuant to Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008 establishing a Community framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the common fisheries policy

Commission Decision No **2010/93/EU** of 18 December 2009 adopting a multiannual Community programme for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector for the period 2011-2013

STECF Plenary and working group reports

STECF, 2010: 33rd Plenary Meeting Report STECF (PLEN-10-01), 26-30 April 2010, Norwich, Ed. by John Casey & Hendrik Dörner, ISBN 978-92-79-15792-9, 110 pp.

SGRN, 2010: Report of the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF), Sub Group on Research Needs (SGRN) and SGECA. Evaluation of 2010 Revised National Programmes and a Roadmap for the Review of Surveys (draft 3).

Other documents

Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for the Baltic Sea (RCM Baltic) 2008

Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for the North Sea & Eastern Arctic (RCM NS&EA) 2008

Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for the North Atlantic (RCM NA) 2008

Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for the Mediterranean & Black Sea (RCM Med&BS) 2008

Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for the Baltic Sea (RCM Baltic) 2009

Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for the North Sea & Eastern Arctic (RCM NS&EA) 2009

Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for the North Atlantic (RCM NA) 2009

Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for the Mediterranean & Black Sea (RCM Med&BS) 2009

Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for Long-Distance Fisheries (RCM LDF) 2010

Report of the 5th Liaison Meeting, Brussels, Feb. 2009

Report of the 6th Liaison Meeting, Hamburg, Dec. 2009

Report of the 7th Liaison Meeting, Ostend, June 2010

ANNEX 1: SGRN 10-02 Terms of Reference

STECF – SGRN 10- 02 Meeting
Monday 5th July to Saturday 10th July 2010
Hamburg, Germany

Terms of Reference

(Final Version)

1. Evaluation of 2009 Annual Reports in accordance with Article 7.2 of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008, taking into account

- a. The execution of the National Programmes 2009
- b. The quality of the data collected by the Member states
- c. Information from end users on data transmission in 2009

2. Review of Comments made at STECF in Spring plenary

In particular the following issues will be dealt with:

Data Deficiencies subgroup to assess the state of play of user's feed back and develop a template and procedure for reporting data deficiencies by data user groups (STECF, ICES, ICCAT, GFCM and other RFMOs or international scientific bodies)

To this end an ad hoc subgroup will be appointed. The main task of this subgroup is identifying data failures in order to allow the Commission to enforce MS obligations on a clear basis. It is expected that quality, comparability and coherence issues will be raised by the economists and biologists, with particular emphasis on quality checks. The following information will be analysed by the subgroup:

- a. Balance of data transmission to end-users in 2009. Particular attention will be paid to the provision of feedback by ICES and relevant RFMOs on data availability, quality, gaps and the data used in the scientific advisory process.
 - b. Response by MS to calls for data for fisheries advice providing data for STECF meetings and evaluation of sub groups' feedback on data quality.
 - c. Response by MS to the call for economic data launched to produce the draft report on the "Economic Performance of EU Fishing Fleet: Annual Report 2010 (AER)"
3. Examine the current status of preparations for the review of research surveys to be carried out in October 2010.
 4. AOB

ANNEX 2: SGRN 10-02 Agenda

Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)

Sub-group on Research Needs (SGRN)

Evaluation of the 2009 Technical Reports
related to the DCF (SGRN 10-02)

Johann Heinrich von Thünen Institute (vTI), Hamburg, Germany

Monday 5th to Saturday 10th July 2010

AGENDA

(Version 3)

Coffee/tea breaks: 10:30, 15:30

Lunch break: 12:45-14:00

Monday 5th July

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 14:00 | Opening of the meeting
Welcome and housekeeping
Introduction round
JRC presentation (STECF Secretariat, Jarno)
Objectives and Terms of Reference of SGRN 10-02
Adoption of the Agenda
Plenary/sub-group working procedures
Formation of sub-groups, allocation of Technical Reports (TRs)
Allocation of participants to sub-groups
Appointment of sub-group rapporteurs
Meeting room allocations

Discussion of template for reviewing TRs (ToR 1)
- > monitoring of performance of the TR guidelines |
| 15:30 | Coffee |
| 16:00 | ICES Presentation (ICES Secretariat, Cristina)
Discussion of procedures for evaluating data transmission by MS (ToR 2)
Report Structure
Report Timelines and STECF
Comments from the Commission |
| 18:00 | Close today's session |

Tuesday, 6th July

09:00	Sub-group meetings
12:45	Lunch
14:00	Sub-group meetings
18:00	Close today's session
19:30	Social dinner at "Ständige Vertretung" (see announcement)

Wednesday, 7th July

09:00	Sub-group meetings
12:45	Lunch
14:00	Sub-group meetings
18:00	Close today's session

Thursday, 8th July

09:00	Sub-group meetings
12:45	Lunch
14:00	Plenary Comments by MS on general & biological parts (20 mins per MS)
16:15	Coffee
16:30	Plenary Comments by MS on general & biological parts (20 mins per MS)
18:00	Close today's session

Friday, 9th July

09:00	Plenary Comments by MS on general & biological parts (15 mins per MS)
10:30	Coffee

- 11:00** **Plenary**
 General comments by Economists
 Outcome and recommendations from Data Transmission sub-group (ToR 2)
- 12:45 Lunch
- 14:00** **Plenary**
 Review of surveys: Status & further steps (ToR 3)
 Comments by the Commission
 Comments by MS on general & biological parts (15 mins per MS)
- 15:30 Coffee
- 16:00** **Plenary**
 General comments
 Any other business (ToR 4)
- 18:00** **Close today's session**

Saturday, 10th July

- 09:00** **Plenary**
 Comments by MS on general & biological parts (15 mins per MS)
 General comments
 Any other business (ToR 4)
- 10:30 Coffee
- 11:00** **Plenary:**
Review of main recommendations
 Final look at text
SGRN meeting schedule 2010-2011, ToRs
- 12:00** **Close of the meeting**

ANNEX 3: SGRN 10-02 contact details for participants

XXXXX (JRC)

ANNEX 4: Evaluation template for 2009 Annual Reports

Compliance class	Compliance level
No	<10%
Partly	10-50%
Mostly	50-90%
Yes	>90%
NA	not applicable

	Member State:		
Module	Questions to be checked by evaluators	Yes/No/ Partly/ Mostly/ NA	SGRN Comments
	Overall compliance		
I.	General framework		
	Is the general framework clearly outlined?		
II.	National data collection organisation		
II.A	National correspondent and participating institutes		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?		
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?		
II.B	Regional and International coordination		
II.B.1	Attendance of international meetings		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?		
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?		
II.B.2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
	Are the general recommendations from all relevant RCMs listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?		
III.	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
III.A	General description of the fishing sector		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?		
III.B	Economic variables		
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
III.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
III.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
III.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		

	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?		
	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
III.B.4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
	REGION XXXXX		
III.C	Biological metier-related variables		
III.C.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
III.C.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?		
	Were CV targets met?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
III.C.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?		
III.C.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
	REGION XXXXX		
III.D	Recreational fisheries		
III.D.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is there a sufficient description of how data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained?		
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
III.D.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?		
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?		
III.D.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?		
III.D.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
	REGION XXXXX		
III.E	Biological stock-related variables		

III.E.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
III.E.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Have CVs been provided?		
	Were CV targets met?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
III.E.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?		
III.E.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
III.F	Transversal variables		
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
III.F.1	Capacity		
III.F.1.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
III.F.1.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?		
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?		
III.F.1.3	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
III.F.2	Effort		
III.F.2.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
III.F.2.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?		
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?		
III.F.2.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?		
III.F.2.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
III.F.3	Landings		
III.F.3.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
III.F.3.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?		

	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?		
III.F.3.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?		
III.F.3.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
III.G	Research surveys at sea (one section for each survey!)		
III.G.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?		
III.G.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is the quality of the survey indices maintained (by e.g. a change in gear settings, insufficient geographical coverage etc.)?		
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?		
III.G.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?		
III.G.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
IV.	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
IV.A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture		
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
IV.A.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
IV.A.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?		
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?		
IV.A.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?		
IV.A.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		

IV.B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry		
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
IV.B.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
	Did MS collect data from enterprises which do not have fish processing as their main activity?		
IV.B.2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Were data quality targets met?		
	Are deviations well explained and justifiable?		
IV.B.3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from the relevant RCM(s) listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?		
IV.B.4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
V.	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
V.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
V.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
VI.	Module for management and use of the data		
VI.1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations well explained and justifiable?		
VI.2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls well described and acceptable?		
VII.	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described and acceptable?		
VIII.	List of acronyms and abbreviations		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?		
IX.	Comments, suggestions and reflections		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?		
X.	References		
	Is there a complete list of references?		
XI.	Annexes		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		
General comments	[Please insert general comments on the AR]		

ANNEX 5

End-user feedback tables: RFMOs

	End user	ICES									
	Stock										
	Data year										
WG - data provided to the Working Group											
SA - data used for the Stock Assessment											
		Belgium		Denmark		Estonia		France		Germany	
		WG	SA	WG	SA	WG	SA	WG	SA	WG	SA
Catches	Landings =total retained catches	Y	Y								
	Discards	Y	Y								
Length Composition	Landings =total retained catches	NP	NBQ								
	Discards	NP	NOR								
Age/Length Key		NP	NR								
Age Composition	Landings	NP	N								
	Discards	NP	N								
Weight at age		NP	NBQ								
Maturity Information		NP	NOR								
Sex ratio		NP	NR								
Tuning fleets	Commercial fleets	NP	N								
	Surveys at sea	NP	N								
Comments											
Database											

ANNEX 6

End-user feedback tables: Fishing effort meetings (SGMOS)

	Working Group										
	Stock										
	WG - data provided by the Working Group SA - data used for the Stock Assessment										
		Belgium		Denmark		Estonia		Finland		France	
		WG	SA	WG	SA	WG	SA	WG	SA	WG	SA
Catches	Landings										
	Discards										
Effort	Nominal effort										
	Effective effort										
Comments											

ANNEX 7

End-user feedback tables: Annual Economic Report (SGECA)

Economic variables

End user				Data reference years provided					
Instructions: Fill the yellow cells. Fill in the data reference years provided To open the options list when filling each cell, just put the mouse cursor over the cell. An Excel comment will appear with the option to insert in the cell (on bold) and the meaning of each option.									
Economic	Variable group	Specific variable	General comment on variable	Belgium			Bulgaria		
				Data provision	Data issue	Comment	Data provision	Data issue	Comment
Economic variables	Fishing enterprises	Fishing enterprises							
	Employment	Number of Engaged Crew							
		FTE National							
		FTE Harmonized							
		Income	Value of landings						
	Income from fishing rights								
	Direct subsidies								
	Other income								
	Expenditure	Crew wages							
		Value of unpaid labour							
		Energy costs							
		Repair costs							
		Variable costs							
		Non variable costs							
		Rights costs							
		Depreciation							
	Capital and investments	Vessel historical value							
		Vessel replacement value							
		Value of fishing rights							
		In-year investments							
Financial position									
				Data provision	Comment on reference year	Data provision	Comment on reference year		
Optional feedback on individual reference year		Reference years	2002						
			2003						
			2004						
			2005						
			2006						
			2007						
			2008						
			2009						
			2010						

ANNEX 8

End-user feedback tables: Annual Economic Report (SGECA)

Transversal variables

End user			Data reference years provided						
Instructions: Fill the yellow cells. Fill in the data reference years provided To open the options list when filling each cell, just put the mouse cursor over the cell. An Excel comment will appear with the option to insert in the cell (on bold) and the meaning of each option.									
Transversal	Variable group	Specific variable	General comment on variable	Belgium			Bulgaria		
				Data provision	Data Issue	Comment	Data provision	Data issue	Comment
Transversal	Capacity	Number of vessels							
		Mean length overall							
		Mean GT							
		Mean kW							
		Mean age							
	Effort	Days at sea							
		Fishing days							
		Energy consumption							
		Number of trips							
		kW Fishing days							
		GT Fishing days							
		Number of fishing operations							
		Number of pots and traps							
		Number of nets							
		Length of nets							
		Number of hooks							
		Soaking time							
		Landings	Weight of landings per species						
	Value of landings per species								
	Price per species								
		General comments on MS data							
				Data provision	Comment on reference year	Data provision	Comment on reference year		
Optional feedback on individual reference year		Reference years	2002						
			2003						
			2004						
			2005						
			2006						
			2007						
			2008						
			2009						
			2010						

ANNEX 9: Stock Data Problems Relevant to Data Collection (ICES WGHMM example)

Stock	Data Problem	How to be addressed	By who	Comments
Mgw-78	Ireland: Revised tuning fleet catches not provided since 2007	LPUE data series stopped in 2006 because of patterns in different areas and major changes in the fleet structure over time.	Ireland and ICES delegate & PGCCDBS & RCM-NA & SGRN	Recommendation already sent last year, and repeated this year. Reply from RCM-NA in 2009: <i>"RCM NA recommends Ireland to clarify the situation directly with the stock coordinator."</i>
Mgw-78	France: No LANDINGS are provided to the group.	STRONG request to MS to provide these data to WGHMM.	France and ICES delegate & PGCCDBS RCM-NA & SGRN	Only applicable 2009 landings.
Mgw-78	France: No update of CPUEs data series are provided to the group.	STRONG request to MS to provide these data to WGHMM.	France and ICES delegate & PGCCDBS RCM-NA & SGRN	Only applicable for 2009
Mgw-78	France: No discard data (biomass, length distributions and age composition) is delivered to the WGHMM since 1998.	STRONG request to MS to provide these data to WGHMM.	France and ICES delegate & PGCCDBS RCM-NA & SGRN	Recommendation already sent last year, and repeated this year. <u>RCM-NA 2009 didn't reply to this recommendation.</u> The lack of this data is compromising the assessment of this stock (currently is a survey trends assessment). The benchmark, planned to be in 2011, was already postponed, due to the lack of data in 2010.
Mgw-78	France: No ALK and consequently age composition of landing and weight at age is provided to the WGHMM routinely.	STRONG request to MS to provide these data to WGHMM	France and ICES delegate & PGCCDBS RCM-NA & SGRN	Recommendation already sent last year, and repeated this year. Reply from RCM-NA in 2009: <i>"RCM NA was informed that this information is now available back in time and will be provided to the 2010 WG."</i>
Mgw-78	United Kingdom: Discards provided to WGHMM but not used because of bad quality of the data. (Actually data is not raised).	Application of recommendations of WS Discards (Charlotte Lund, 2003) and future WS on discards (2009)	UK and PGCCDBS RCM-NA & SGRN	Recommendation already sent last year, and repeated this year. Reply from RCM-NA in 2009: <i>"RCM NA recommends UK to contact WG stock coordinator to clarify requirements."</i>

Stock	Data Problem	How to be addressed	By who	Comments
Mgb-8c9a	The following data, which are relevant for the assessment, are missing from Portugal: discards (total and length composition), abundance indices-at-length or age suitable to be used as tuning fleets	Request the appropriate data from Portugal, with indicators of quality	Portugal and PGCCDBS RCM-NA & SGRN	Recommendation already sent last year, and repeated this year. Reply from RCM-NA in 2009: "Portugal indicated that they presented data in document in 2008. RCM NA recommends Portugal to contact stock coordinator directly for clarification."
Ang-78	United Kingdom, Spain and Ireland: Discards provided to WGHMM but not used because of bad quality of the data. (Doubts about the adequacy of raising methodology used).	Application of recommendations of WS Discards (Charlotte Lund, 2003) and future WS on discards (2009)	UK, IRL, SP and PGCCDBS RCM-NA & SGRN	Recommendation already sent last year, and repeated this year. Reply from RCM-NA in 2009: "Countries are recommended to provide information on number of trips, number of hauls, raising factors and coefficient of variation (See ICES WKPRESISE recommendations). Additionally the WG would like to have information about outliers analyses, if any were conducted and how they were treated. RCM NA also encourages the use of COST tools data investigation and raising."
Ang-78	France: Neither landings nor length distribution data is delivered to the WGHMM.	STRONG request to MS to provide these data to WGHMM.	France and ICES delegate & PGCCDBS RCM-NA & SGRN	
Ang-78	France: No discard data is delivered to the WGHMM.	STRONG request to MS to provide these data to WGHMM	France and ICES delegate & PGCCDBS RCM-NA & SGRN	Recommendation already sent last year, and repeated this year. Reply from RCM-NA in 2009: RCM NA was informed that France will provide available data for future WG.
Ang-78	The precise methodology used for splitting catches between both Lophius species is not available to the WGHMM and no precision estimates are delivered	STRONG request to MS to provide these data to WGHMM.	PGCCDBS RCM-NA & SGRN	
Ang-78	Available maturity data recorded under DCF is not being delivered to WGHMM	STRONG request to MS to provide these data to WGHMM.	PGCCDBS RCM-NA & SGRN	

Stock	Data Problem	How to be addressed	By who	Comments
Ang-78	Sex-ratio data recorded under DCF is not being delivered to WGHMM	STRONG request to MS to provide these data to WGHMM	PGCCDBS RCM-NA & SGRN	
Ang-78	Growth at length data recorded under DCF is not being delivered to WGHMM	STRONG request to MS to provide these data to WGHMM.	PGCCDBS RCM-NA & SGRN	
Ang-89	<p>The metier sampling adopted in Spain and Portugal in 2009, following the requirement of the EU Data Collection Framework, can have an effect in the provided data.</p> <p>Problems with the splitting of the two species have been detected.</p> <p>Inconsistencies in length composition of landings.</p> <p>An important reduction of Portuguese sampling levels was observed in 2009.</p>	<p>Revision of 2009 Spanish landings data.</p> <p>Revision of 2009 Spanish length samplings.</p>	Spain, Portugal and PGCCDBS RCM-NA & SGRN	
Northern Hake	France: very poor quality 2009 landing and discard data provided this year which lead the Working group not to update the assessment	Request to France to provide a revision of the data	France and ICES delegate & PGCCDBS RCM-NA & SGRN	
BB sole	Need to find out the cause of the discrepancy between French and Belgian weights at age.	Otolith exchange	France, Belgium and PGCCDBS	

ANNEX DECLARATIONS OF EXPERTS

Declarations of invited experts are published on the STECF web site on <https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home> together with the final report.

European Commission

EUR 24535EN – Joint Research Centre – Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Title: Evaluation of 2009 Annual Reports related to the Data Collection Framework. Report of the Subgroup on Research Needs (SGRN 10-02).

Author(s): Stransky, C., Adamidou, A., Apostolou, A., Armesto, A., Bengtsberg, R., Berkenhagen, J., Cardinale, M., Carpentieri, P., Davidjuka, I., Degel, H., Dias, M., DiNatale, A., Dintheer, C., Ebeling, M., Goti, L., Gravino, F., Gustavsson, T., Longoni, E., Myllylä, T., Nermer, T., Ní Chonchúir, G., Pinello, D., Raid, T., Sics, I., Ulleweit, J., Vassallo, D., Virtanen, J., Wieland, K., Zarauz, L.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

2010 – 274 pp. – 21 x 29.7 cm

EUR – Scientific and Technical Research series – ISSN 1018-5593

ISBN 978-92-79-16789-8

doi:10.2788/18683

Abstract

Articles 6(1) and 7(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008 state that the evaluation of both National Programme proposals and Annual Reports (AR) should be carried out by STECF. The main objectives of the meeting were to evaluate the AR 2009, to advise on a procedure for the identification of data deficiencies, and to examine the current status of preparations for the review of research surveys.

STECF reviewed the report during its plenary meeting on 12-16 July 2010 in Copenhagen.

How to obtain EU publications

Our priced publications are available from EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>), where you can place an order with the sales agent of your choice.

The Publications Office has a worldwide network of sales agents. You can obtain their contact details by sending a fax to (352) 29 29-42758.

The mission of the JRC is to provide customer-driven scientific and technical support for the conception, development, implementation and monitoring of EU policies. As a service of the European Commission, the JRC functions as a reference centre of science and technology for the Union. Close to the policy-making process, it serves the common interest of the Member States, while being independent of special interests, whether private or national.



The Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) has been established by the European Commission. The STECF is being consulted at regular intervals on matters pertaining to the conservation and management of living aquatic resources, including biological, economic, environmental, social and technical considerations.